

**HARVARD COLLEGE
LIBRARY**



**GIFT OF THE
GOVERNMENT
OF THE UNITED STATES**

57/1

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES (THE COMMITTEE TO SECURE JUSTICE IN THE ROSENBERG CASE AND AFFILIATES)—PART I

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS FIRST SESSION

AUGUST 2 AND 3, 1955

PART I

(Index in Part II of this series)

Printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities



GOVERNMENT LIBRARY
ACQUIRED BY THE
UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

NOV 2 1955

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1955

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania, *Chairman*

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri

CLYDE DOYLE, California

JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR., Tennessee

EDWIN E. WILLIS, Louisiana

HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois

BERNARD W. KEARNEY, New York

DONALD L. JACKSON, California

GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio

THOMAS W. BEALE, Sr., *Chief Clerk*

CONTENTS

PART I

August 2, 1955:	
Testimony of—	Page
James W. Glatis.....	2044
Herman Tamsky.....	2054
Afternoon session:	
Herman Tamsky (resumed).....	2058
Philip Koritz.....	2065
Herman Tamsky (resumed).....	2070
Don Rothenberg.....	2071
Mrs. Mildred Rothenberg.....	2087
John Gilman.....	2090
August 3, 1955:	
Testimony of—	
Herman E. Thomas.....	2101
Mrs. Sylvia Freedland.....	2116
Mrs. Adelaide Riskin.....	2118
Mrs. Jean D. Frantjis.....	2119
Afternoon session:	
Herman E. Thomas (resumed).....	2124
Theodore E. Norton.....	2124
John B. Stone.....	2142
Mrs. Ethel Weichbrod.....	2147
Anzelm A. Czarnowski.....	2150
Mrs. Josephine Granat.....	2155
Ruth Belmont.....	2160
Index. (See pt. II.)	

PART II

August 4, 1955:	
Testimony of—	
Milton J. Santwire.....	2165
Eve Neidelman.....	2173
Mrs. Emily Alman.....	2179
Afternoon session:	
Mrs. Emily Alman (resumed).....	2187
David Alman.....	2197
Mrs. Emily Alman (resumed).....	2205
David Alman (resumed).....	2206
August 5, 1955:	
Testimony of—	
David Alman (resumed).....	2217
Louis Harap.....	2239
Index.....	i

PUBLIC LAW 601, 79TH CONGRESS

The legislation under which the House Committee on un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress [1946], chapter 753, 2d session, which provides:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, * * **

PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

RULE X

SEC. 121. STANDING COMMITTEES

* * * * *

17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

(q) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.

(A) Un-American Activities.

(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

RULES ADOPTED BY THE 84TH CONGRESS

House Resolution 5, January 5, 1955

* * * * *

RULE X

STANDING COMMITTEES

1. There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress, the following standing committees:

* * * * *

(q) Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

* * * * *

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

17. Committee on Un-American Activities.

(a) Un-American Activities.

(b) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time, investigations of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES (THE COMMITTEE TO SECURE JUSTICE IN THE ROSENBERG CASE AND AFFILIATES)—PART I

TUESDAY, AUGUST 2, 1955

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

PUBLIC HEARING

A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met at 10 a. m., pursuant to notice, in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building, Hon. Francis E. Walter (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Francis E. Walter, Edwin E. Willis, and Gordon H. Scherer.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, counsel, George C. Williams, investigator.

Chairman WALTER. The subcommittee will be in order.

Let the record show that pursuant to law, I, Francis E. Walter, chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, have appointed a subcommittee composed of Representatives Edwin E. Willis, of Louisiana; Gordon H. Scherer, of Ohio; and myself, as chairman, to conduct these hearings.

The committee has received numerous inquiries from Members of Congress and private citizens as to whether organizations established throughout the United States known by various names such as "The Committee to Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case," "To Secure Clemency for the Rosenbergs," and "To Secure Justice for Morton Sobell" are being exploited by the Communist Party for ideological purposes as distinguished from humane purposes, and inquiring as to the extent of Communist Party control or influence in the establishment and operation of such organizations. In response to these inquiries, and in discharge of the legislative duties placed upon this committee, the Committee on Un-American Activities has decided to hold hearings beginning today for the purpose of investigating the extent, character and objects of Communist Party propaganda activities within such organizations.

Mr. Tavenner, call your first witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. James W. Glatis.

Chairman WALTER. Raise your right hand please. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God.

Mr. GLATIS. I do, sir.

TESTIMONY OF JAMES W. GLATIS

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you Mr. James W. Glatis?

Mr. GLATIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell your last name, please, sir?

Mr. GLATIS. G-l-a-t-i-s.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you familiar with the rule of this committee, that any witness has the right to have counsel with him during the course of his interrogation?

Mr. GLATIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Glatis?

Mr. GLATIS. Lynn, Mass., May 7, 1926.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your present occupation?

Mr. GLATIS. I am employed by the Sun Life Insurance Company of Canada, out of its Boston office.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you reside in the city of Boston?

Mr. GLATIS. In one of the suburbs, Jamaica Plain.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been?

Mr. GLATIS. High school, 2 years of electronics, and subsidiary courses dealing with my own profession at the present time, that is, sales executive management and training, and a course I am undertaking with the company at the present time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you served in the Armed Forces of the United States?

Mr. GLATIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over what period of time?

Mr. GLATIS. In 1944. I went in August 1, 1944, and was discharged in November of 1944 as a result of injuries received in the infantry training. Again I went back into the service in 1946 and was discharged in 1947. Since 1947 up until the present time, I have been a member of the United States Army Reserve.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Glatis, will you tell the committee, please, whether or not you had occasion to become, organizationally speaking, a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. GLATIS. Yes, sir, I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. I used the term "organizationally speaking" to differentiate between mere membership and that of dedicated ideological reasons for becoming a member.

Mr. GLATIS. I understand, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were the circumstances under which you became a member, organizationally speaking?

Mr. GLATIS. In the summer of 1948, while working as a professional photographer in the city of Boston, I had occasion to attend my employer's wedding at which I met with two individuals, as a result of participating during the wedding proceedings, and we got to discuss the question of racial prejudice and intolerance, which I was intensely interested in, and the fact that there was considerable activity in Greece, that is, the entire Balkan situation, with specific mention of Greece, the political situation.

As a result of these conversations, and more particularly the result of discussing the question of racial prejudice and intolerance, I was invited by these two individuals to attend a meeting being sponsored by the Civil Rights Congress. At that particular moment I didn't

commit myself to attending this particular meeting, but the next day I made a telephone call to the local office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to determine whether or not this organization was listed as a subversive organization on the Attorney General's list. The agent with whom I discussed this situation over the phone told me that it was, and he asked to see me and discussed the circumstances surrounding as to how I came to hear about this organization.

I did in fact see this agent, who requested that I attend this meeting if possible, and take pictures at the same time, and to present a report and any copies of pictures I might have taken to this agent.

Very briefly, after my first meeting with this particular agent, or—incidentally I was called upon to join the Civil Rights Congress at that particular evening where I attended this session, and was instructed by the FBI agent who told me to go along with anything they asked—I signed up with the organization as a result.

Shortly thereafter I received a call by several people of this particular organization, the Civil Rights Congress, to come up to their headquarters to help them in their mailing of some literature. I again contacted the agent that I had first spoken to, who again requested that I follow through.

A week later I was called up to the office of the FBI, in Boston, and I had a long conversation with the agent whom I first contacted, at which time he requested that I continue to operate in this particular manner, saying nothing to anybody that I maintained any relationship of any sort with the FBI. He told me that as a result of my attending or working with this particular organization I had an opportunity to become a member of the Communist Party, possibly. He told me at the time that if I volunteered to do this, that I would be given to understand there would be no pay involved, that in the event I became involved in any difficulty, he couldn't promise to help me.

So in December of 1948 I consented to go along with the suggestion of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Six months later as a result of attending various classes given by the Communist Party, not necessarily the Communist Party but given at the Boston School of Marxist Studies, run by the chairman of the Communist Party of Massachusetts, I became a member of the Communist Party in April 1949.

Mr. TAVENNER. And you became a member at the request and suggestion of the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. GLATIS. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALTER. What was the date, please?

Mr. GLATIS. April 1949.

Chairman WALTER. Where was the school located?

Mr. GLATIS. In Boston, sir, at the home of the chairman of the Communist Party of Massachusetts.

Chairman WALTER. Where was that?

Mr. GLATIS. On Fasin Street, Roxbury, Mass.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the name of the chairman of the Communist Party who conducted this school?

Mr. GLATIS. Otis Hood.

Mr. TAVENNER. After becoming a member of the Communist Party, did you make reports to the Federal Bureau of Investigation of infor-

mation which you acquired of activities of the Communist Party and its members?

Mr. GLATIS. I kept a steady relationship. I maintained a steady relationship with several agents of the FBI, either through a telephone or written or various other means of communication, constantly reporting all of my activities within these organizations.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your principal activity as a Communist Party member at the instance of the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. GLATIS. I maintained several positions. At the outset I was primarily involved in doing photography work for the Communist Party and assigned to several youth organizations.

In 1949 I was assigned to work with what was called the East Boston Branch of the Communist Party. During this time, or let me put it this way, from December of 1948 until May of 1954 when I testified before the Subversive Activities Control Board, I associated and participated in the activities of many front organizations during the same time I was a member of the Communist Party.

In 1950, I carried on, chronologically, I was assigned by one of the functionaries of the Communist Party to work in a three-man secret cell within the General Electric Co.

In 1951, in the early spring, I was instructed by a member of the review commission of the Communist Party, to set myself up in an underground status, on a sleeper basis. His reasons that he gave me were the fact that there was legislation being proposed in the State of Massachusetts outlawing the Communist Party, and that because of my own position within the General Electric Co., where I worked in secret areas, he felt for my own security I should maintain a sleeper basis, and instructed me to work from then on through front organizations, that is party-front organizations. That I did up until May of 1954, of last year.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were the major front organizations to which you were assigned by the Communist Party?

Mr. GLATIS. It was practically a blanket situation. When an individual is a member of the Communist Party, he normally participates in most of the activities of the various front organizations, within that area. On a couple of occasions I was actually assigned by the party to a few of these front organizations.

But to get back to your question, the organizations I dealt with while I was a member of the Communist Party, that is, the front organizations I dealt with, were the Labor Youth League, the Civil Rights Congress, the Massachusetts Council of American-Soviet Friendship, of which I was one of the directors; the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, the Boston Committee for the Freedom of the Press, the Boston Committee To Seek Clemency for the Rosenbergs. There were several other groups that I worked with at the instruction of the Communist Party, one of which was the Young Progressives of America.

There were splinter organizations. I say "splinter" for example, an organization that we set up overnight. That is, my own East Boston branch of the Communist Party set up overnight, an organization known as the East Boston Tenants Committee to Protest Evictions, but this was just for the purpose of agitation and propaganda in a particular area, and the organization didn't last too long.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the interest of saving time in this hearing, I will not be able to question you in detail about these various front groups. Possibly at a later date we will. But at this time I wish you would describe to the committee in a general way how Communist Party members, and why Communist Party members were expected to take part in these various front groups with which you worked.

Mr. GLATIS. Primarily, the majority of the work the Communist Party, that is legal work, above the surface, the only manifestations you see of Communist Party activities are through front organizations, which are used for the distribution of propaganda, or for the manner in which they bring their propaganda to the masses, so to speak. They must set up a front organization with seemingly innocent title or innocuous title, and otherwise sometimes the public itself would not readily accept some of the propaganda that the party or the Communist Party itself hopes to get to the masses.

The front group itself serves basic purposes of recruiting grounds for new members, such as my own case, and I first became a member of a front group such as the Civil Rights Congress, which eventually brought me into the Communist Party. It also serves as a proving ground for new members of the Communist Party, such as again in my own case where I was sent back into a front group to work after becoming a member of the Communist Party. As I pointed out before, it also serves the purpose of using them as a springboard for Communist Party propaganda. Very important also, it serves as a basis of financially assisting the Communist Party, in that a great deal of money that comes into the front group necessarily goes to the Communist Party as such since the front group is set up by the Communist Party. I may say at this time that I can't recall any time that I was working with the Communist Party that when a front group was set up or a branch of it, the local branch of it, of a national group was set up, that the same group of party members circulated from one front group to the other. If the Boston Committee for the Freedom of the Press had a meeting, the same faces would show up, and if the Civil Rights Congress had a meeting, the same faces would show up.

In other words, it was practically mandatory that you support the activities of all of these groups in this area, the front groups set up by the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. In these groups that you call Communist-front groups, was the leadership Communist Party leadership?

Mr. GLATIS. To a great extent; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Through this interlocking system of prominent Communist Party individuals in leadership in these organizations was the Communist Party able to influence and direct the work of those groups?

Mr. GLATIS. There is no question about it, sir. As far as I can recall myself, there was no question as to the leadership of the organization. A party member was taken out of circulation for a while, and when I say "taken out of circulation," I mean out of his regular party work for example, and told to set up an organization in which he was made chairman of it. There is no doubt in my mind, because I recall several instances, where discussions were brought up in my own branch wherein we discussed certain front organizations. I would like to be a little bit more specific to give the committee an idea.

In 1953, I attended a meeting in New York City, a joint meeting of various front groups such as the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship and the Labor Youth League, and Civil Rights Congress. At this particular meeting in New York, the question arose as to the amount of activity. There wasn't a sufficient amount of activity as brought up by this particular convention. We were told at that time we should go back to our respective areas and promote a greater amount of activity.

When I returned to Boston I happened to attend a meeting of the Boston Freedom of the Press Committee. The president of this particular meeting was a woman by the name of Ann Burlak who, at one time, was a member of the national committee of the Communist Party of the United States. I mentioned to Ann Burlak the fact that one of the biggest points made at this particular convention was that there wasn't sufficient activity in the hinterland, and in the other areas outside of the national office in New York. More specifically, I pointed out to her that the Civil Rights Congress hadn't been too active. Ann Burlak told me at the time that they were going to replace the chairman of the Civil Rights Congress.

Now, the reason I make that point is that here is a functionary of the Communist Party telling me that the chairman will be replaced, and the chairman of a seemingly innocent organization, as they profess to be, having no connection with the Communist Party, was going to be replaced.

Ann Burlak, I may point out, held a very powerful position within that area, and she was also a member of the review commission which I had appeared before at one time. So in a sense, if an individual was taken, as I said, out of Communist Party circulation, out of his regular work, and told to set up an organization, he was constantly under the direction and control of party leadership within that area. That was true at all times.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you, as a member of these various front organizations, subject to the directions and control of the Communist Party?

Mr. GLATIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated in the earlier part of your testimony that in several instances you were appointed by individuals to work with various organizations. To what instances did you refer?

Mr. GLATIS. On two occasions I received instructions—and on one occasion it was Ann Burlak who told me to work; it was Edith Abber, who is now under indictment by the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the last name?

Mr. GLATIS. A-b-b-e-r.

Mr. TAVENNER. Edith Abber?

Mr. GLATIS. Yes, sir; who instructed me to work with the Labor Youth League. There in that case it was a situation where a recognized functionary within the Communist Party, primarily handling youth activities, instructed me to work with the Labor Youth League which was another one of the front organizations.

Again, on another occasion, I discussed my position in the Massachusetts Council of American-Soviet Friendship with Ann Burlak, the individual I mentioned previously, who told me to maintain my status as a director on this particular board that had been set up—

with the Massachusetts Council of American-Soviet Friendship board. I wouldn't have been able to maintain, or very bluntly, if Ann Burlak had told me no, I wouldn't have served on that particular board.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Elizabeth Moos active in any of these front organizations to which you have referred?

Mr. GLATIS. Yes, sir; Elizabeth Moos was the individual who appointed me on the board of directors.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of what organization?

Mr. GLATIS. The Massachusetts Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

Mr. TAVENNER. You made reference to one of the objectives of the Communist Party in this front organizational work having to do with financial matters. How did the Communist Party utilize these fronts in a financial way?

Mr. GLATIS. Well, it was practically SOP, or "standard operating procedure," every time a meeting was held, a front meeting, the hat would be passed around or collections would be made, or a drive for funds would be called for, and there were usually contributions made right then and there, and pledges were made at these various meetings.

In other words, it was a standard operating procedure at all of these front group meetings to request donations and funds for the purpose of keeping that organization going.

Mr. TAVENNER. But those were meetings of the front organizations.

Mr. GLATIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, would not the money be used for the front organization, as distinguished from the Communist Party proper or other purposes of the Communist Party?

Mr. GLATIS. I make no distinction between the front groups and the Communist Party, simply because if a Communist Party member picks up the money, I know the Communist Party in our area set up the organization; to me the front group and the Communist Party in this particular instance are one and the same. If for example, \$500 is required to keep this particular organization in continuous operation in the distribution of leaflets, for printing purposes, and things of that nature, and they collect \$1,000, most naturally the balance of that money would be used for the Communist Party in other fields of endeavor, or other front-group activity.

In other words, if the money comes through a front group, it doesn't necessarily mean that the front group as such—they are all paper organizations, so to speak.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not in Boston there was an organization formed known as the Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case, or some such similar title?

Mr. GLATIS. Yes, sir; there was. In 1952 an organization was set up, I believe it was called, Boston Committee To Seek Clemency for the Rosenbergs, and I believe that was done in the early part of 1952.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall having heard that matter discussed among members of the Communist Party—that is, such an organization prior to the time of its formation?

Mr. GLATIS. There was considerable discussion concerning the national organization of the Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case, and the necessity and need for activity of that same type within the Boston area.

Mr. TAVENNER. How did such a question arise?

Mr. GLATIS. Well, the free discussions held between party members of the various front-group meetings—I would like to point out here that in 1952 things became rather tight within the Massachusetts area, because they had passed legislation outlawing the Communist Party, so that there was no actual above-ground activity on the part of the Communist Party, and most of the activity was carried through these front organizations. My attending a front-group meeting—while I attended it, of course I met with other Communist Party members, and we discussed various issues and activities that were carried on by the party in that area.

It was at these particular meetings that the Rosenberg question was brought up and the work conducted by the national organization, distribution of leaflets, not to a great extent in that particular stage of the game, but we had received some literature, I believe, from the Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case, and it was there that the question was discussed freely among the members of the Communist Party in that area, the need of more activity in the Boston area.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you yourself have anything to do with the formation of such an organization?

Mr. GLATIS. Not necessarily in the formation; no, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say there was such an organization formed in 1952?

Mr. GLATIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know the location of its headquarters at the time of its establishment?

Mr. GLATIS. I believe it was in Herman Tamsky's home.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell his last name, please?

Mr. GLATIS. T-a-m-s-k-y.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the home of Herman Tamsky?

Mr. GLATIS. Yes, sir. If I am not mistaken, I believe it was 406 Massachusetts Avenue. At least that is where the headquarters, once the organization was formed, that particular address was used as its headquarters, and later on they moved to 93 Massachusetts Avenue, which was the regular office building.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say you believed that that address, 406 Massachusetts Avenue, was the home of Herman Tamsky?

Mr. GLATIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know what position Herman Tamsky had, if any, in the organization known as the Boston Committee To Seek Clemency in the Rosenberg Case or some similar organization?

Mr. GLATIS. Yes, sir; he was the chairman.

Mr. TAVENNER. He was the chairman?

Mr. GLATIS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he known to you as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. GLATIS. He was known to me as a member of the Communist Party but I have to qualify that, sir. I attended no actual undercover, and when I say "undercover," I mean closed party meetings, with Herman Tamsky. My own east Boston branch of the Communist Party met in his home.

Mr. TAVENNER. Met in Herman Tamsky's home?

Mr. GLATIS. Yes, sir. His wife was a member of my particular branch of the Communist Party. In addition to that, there was certain common information, that was common to members of the Communist Party, which was common to Herman Tamsky and myself, or within discussions that we held at one time or another with his wife and several other members of the Communist Party. The Communist Party discussions were discussed freely in his presence. This is the only way I can determine that he was a member of the Communist Party, in that I worked with his wife and we met in his home, and that we discussed party matters in his presence in which he took part.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether or not Herman Tamsky was present at any of the meetings of your club, of which he was not a member, but which were held in his home?

Mr. GLATIS. He didn't participate actively within my own branch of the Communist Party. I believe it was only on one occasion that he might have been present. That is, he didn't stay for the meeting, but he was present I believe when the meeting started. Very vaguely I can recall his presence.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee if you know, who was the executive secretary of the Boston Committee To Seek Clemency in the Rosenberg Case?

Mr. GLATIS. A woman by the name of Sue Koritz.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not Sue Koritz was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. GLATIS. Yes, she was; that I can definitely state.

Mr. TAVENNER. On what do you base your identification?

Mr. GLATIS. In June of 1950 we had a policy meeting, that is, the Communist Party District No. 1 had a policy meeting, wherein they discussed the Korean situation, and a letter was read from the national secretary of the Communist Party. The letter was read by the district organizer of the Communist Party, and all major functionaries of the Communist Party were present, and there was a certain amount of security at this particular meeting. By "security" I mean when I first entered the premises, I was questioned as to who had sent me to attend this particular meeting. I had received my instructions to attend this meeting by word of mouth, that is, from Ann Burlak, and this seemed to satisfy the person who was at the door when I said Ann Burlak had sent me. This was a closed party meeting, which Sue Koritz attended.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with her husband, Philip Koritz?

Mr. GLATIS. Yes, sir; I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you mention the name of Philip Koritz a little earlier in your testimony?

Mr. GLATIS. I might have, sir. I knew both of them. I knew both of them as being members of the Communist Party. Philip Koritz also attended this same meeting. I believe at one time, Philip Koritz was the chairman of the Civil Rights Congress, and he was the individual that I referred to when Ann Burlak told me that the chairman would be replaced and when Ann Burlak made that statement she was talking of replacing Philip Koritz as chairman of that particular organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not Philip Koritz was identified in any way with the work of the Boston Committee To Seek Clemency in the Rosenberg Case?

Mr. GLATIS. Only to the extent where he took part in the picketing before the statehouse which the Boston Committee To Seek Clemency in the Rosenberg Case had set up, and Philip Koritz and many other members of the Communist Party took part in this picketline set up before the statehouse in Boston. As to any of his other activities, I am not quite sure, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell the committee, please, the names of other members of the Communist Party you can recall who were active in the work of the Boston Committee To Seek Clemency in the Rosenberg Case?

Mr. GLATIS. Edith Abber, as I mentioned before, one of the functionaries in the Communist Party. Sid Ravden, who was a member, and also attended this same policy meeting that I discussed before, and Herbert Zimmerman, who I suppose you classify as literary director or educational director of the Communist Party, and also under indictment by the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you say that Edith Abber is likewise under indictment?

Mr. GLATIS. Yes, sir; they are now out on bail.

Mr. WILLIS. Indictment for what?

Mr. GLATIS. I believe it is teaching and advocating the overthrow of the Government by force and violence. That is, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts by force and violence. The prosecution of that case, sir, is awaiting a decision by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe you stated that you had attended Communist Party meetings in the home of the wife of Herman Tamsky, or Herman Tamsky's home.

Mr. GLATIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was his wife's name?

Mr. GLATIS. Florence.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was she active in any way in connection with the Rosenberg committee?

Mr. GLATIS. There again to the extent of the active participation of many Communist Party members, may I point out that this organization, they are another type of paper organization, there was no actual, nobody signed up with the organization, and the organization was set up and party members participated in the activity of this organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. There is no such thing as registered members?

Mr. GLATIS. No, sir. Actually the activity that this particular committee carried on was distribution of leaflets and pamphlets and picketing, and the seeking of signatures for clemency for the Rosenbergs. Florence Tamsky participated in that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend any meetings of this group, the Boston Committee To Seek Clemency in the Rosenberg Case?

Mr. GLATIS. Yes, sir; they had one meeting that I do recall—that I personally attended was held I believe in January of 1953, at which time Emily Alman, I believe it is A-l-m-a-n, who was a member, served as an official of the National Committee To Secure Justice in the

Rosenberg Case, who addressed this particular meeting and it was held at Morton's Plaza, in Boston, or rather in Dorchester, at which time she discussed the formation of the national committee, and how it was set up, the sponsors of this particular organization, how they had gone about to secure the sponsors of this organization such as Professor Urey, and the deceased Albert Einstein, and what have you. The chairman of this particular meeting was the chairman of the committee, Herman Tamsky. I believe it was Mrs. Emily Alman who went into great detail as to the difficulties at the beginning to set up this particular organization, and asked for support from the local organization and described how difficult it would be in some cases to solicit the support of the public on this particular case.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you receive quantities of literature emanating from the Boston Committee To Seek Clemency in the Rosenberg Case?

Mr. GLATIS. Yes, I did; through the mails.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that by virtue of your membership in these various front organizations, or the Communist Party?

Mr. GLATIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, if you can, what was the purpose of the Communist Party in having its members become active in an organization of this character?

Mr. GLATIS. Basically let me say that this was standard procedure for a party member to become involved in the activity any front organization set up in any area. It was threefold:

First, the securing of financial assistance, or securing funds for the Communist Party, and, secondly, there was the necessity of using this particular issue on a basis of propagandizing the fact that one of the reasons why the Rosenbergs were being executed was because they were Jewish. In other words, giving them a foundational basis for preaching there was anti-Semitism in the United States; and, third, and most important to the Communist Party, was the fact that there were anti-Semitic programs taking place within the Soviet Union.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were those programs at that particular time?

Mr. GLATIS. I believe the case of the Jewish doctors that was taking place in the Soviet Union. Actually, of necessity, it is necessary to preach what is taking place in someone else's backyard to smokescreen what is taking place in your own yard, such as in the case of the programs taking place within the Soviet Union.

Mr. SCHERER. Will you repeat that last statement of yours? I did not hear it; about the smoke in your backyard.

Mr. GLATIS. In other words, sir, sometimes of necessity it is necessary to preach what is happening, what is taking place in someone else's backyard to smokescreen what is taking place in your own yard. In other words, the fact that there were anti-Semitic purges taking place within the Soviet Union just about that time, of necessity, the party would preach that there was anti-Semitism in the United States, and one of the reasons they wanted to have this issue was the Rosenberg case itself, and one of the reasons why they were being executed was because they were Jewish, and this was another phase of the anti-Semitism or anti-Semitic activity taking place in the United States.

Mr. TAVENNER. Therefore it was those same issues that the Communist Party desired to raise and to propagandize?

Mr. GLATIS. I can safely say, sir, that the Communist Party as far as my own knowledge is concerned, didn't give a hoot about the Rosenbergs, or never gave a hoot about any of the individuals whom they allegedly supported, because of the Willie McGee case, or other individuals whose issues it has picked up and carried along and milked to the extent of whatever they could financially and from a propaganda viewpoint. It is a long time since Willie McGee has been hanged and buried, and there is very little discussion as to what happened to Willie McGee, the fact he was a Negro, and supposedly railroaded.

The Communist Party, as far as I could possibly determine used various issues for its own purposes, of agitation and propagandizing.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WALTER. Are there any questions, Mr. Willis?

Mr. WILLIS. None.

Chairman WALTER. Any questions, Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. No questions.

Chairman WALTER. I want to take this opportunity of thanking you for coming here to assist us in our very unpleasant work. More important than that I think is the debt the citizens of the United States owe you, and those who, like you, are endeavoring to expose the machinations of this group of conspirators. Your contribution is as great, perhaps, or greater than what you contributed to the preservation of this republic by your military service, and I thank you.

Mr. GLATIS. Thank you very much, sir.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

Chairman WALTER. Call your next witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Herman Tamsky.

Chairman WALTER. Will you raise your right hand, please? Do you swear that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. TAMSKY. I do.

TESTIMONY OF HERMAN TAMSKY, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, JOSEPH FORER

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name please, sir?

Mr. TAMSKY. Herman Tamsky. T-a-m-s-k-y.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted that you are accompanied by counsel. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. FORER. Joseph Forer, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Tamsky?

Mr. TAMSKY. April 2, 1915, in New Haven, Conn.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. TAMSKY. In Boston, Mass.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in Boston?

Mr. TAMSKY. Seven years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you reside in Boston?

Mr. TAMSKY. 56 Receiver Street, Boston.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever lived at 406 Massachusetts Avenue, Boston?

Mr. TAMSKY. Yes, I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over what period of time did you live there?

Mr. TAMSKY. It was 1951 to 1953.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the name of the place located at 93 Massachusetts Avenue?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. TAMSKY. I refuse to answer on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask you to direct the witness to answer the question, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WALTER. You are directed to answer the question.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. TAMSKY. I abide by my refusal.

Chairman WALTER. Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was room 314 at the address of 93 Massachusetts Avenue a room with which you were acquainted?

Mr. TAMSKY. I refuse to answer on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Tamsky, on December 30, 1952, according to the records of our committee, there was sent a telegram to Congressman McCormack, of Massachusetts, and the Congressman called it to the attention of this committee. It was signed by Tamsky as chairman, Boston Committee To Secure Clemency in the Rosenberg Case. The address was listed as room 314, 93 Massachusetts Avenue.

Did you send a telegram at about that date, December 30, 1952, to Congressman McCormack?

Mr. TAMSKY. I decline to answer on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer that question.

Mr. TAMSKY. I decline to answer on the basis that I have already stated.

Chairman WALTER. Have you the telegram, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir, the telegram was returned to Mr. McCormack's office, and he has been unable to find the telegram itself. We only have a memorandum in our files with regard to it.

On December 30, 1952, were you chairman of the Boston Committee to Secure Clemency in the Rosenberg Case?

Mr. TAMSKY. I decline to answer on the same basis that I have used before.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I ask you to direct the witness to answer that question.

Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer that question.

Mr. SCHERER. How could chairmanship of this committee possibly incriminate him?

Chairman WALTER. Not unless he knows more about the committee.

Mr. SCHERER. I still think under the present condition of the record, he should be required to answer.

Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer that question.

Mr. TAMSKY. I decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment, as I have already used it previously in previous answers.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a member of or an officer of the Boston Committee to Secure Clemency in the Rosenberg Case at this time, or of any other successor group or organization such as, for instance, the Committee To Secure Justice for Morton Sobell?

Mr. TAMSKY. If you are going to ask any more questions along this line, I can tell you right now that my response is going to be a refusal to answer on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment, not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your answer to the question I asked you?

Mr. TAMSKY. The response to your question, I am going to refuse to answer on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you confer with members of the Communist Party regarding your proposed election as chairman of the Boston Committee To Secure Clemency for the Rosenbergs prior to any action by that organization in selecting a chairman?

Mr. TAMSKY. I am going to use my privilege as I have used it previously in answer to this question. I refuse to answer on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you aware of the presence of any person known to you to be a member of the Communist Party in any office of the Boston Committee To Secure Clemency for the Rosenbergs or any successor organization?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. TAMSKY. Inasmuch as you insist upon my using these responses, I am going to continue. I refuse to answer on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. SCHERER. We are not insisting that you use those responses, we are asking you to answer the questions.

Mr. TAMSKY. The question always appears to be the same, loaded questions to me, and I refuse to answer this past question on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Chairman WALTER. Why not just say "for the same reason" and it will be understood it is for the reasons you have already stated?

Mr. TAMSKY. For the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend a convention held in the city of Chicago in 1953?

Mr. TAMSKY. The same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. For the same reason?

Mr. TAMSKY. For the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a photostatic copy of a credential application, and I ask you if you authorized that credential application to be made for you?

(A document was handed to the witness.)

Mr. TAMSKY. I am going to use the same answer I used in the previous question.

Mr. SCHERER. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that we should cut these answers down to merely the witness saying "the same answer." I think that he should say "I refuse to answer for the same reasons."

Chairman WALTER. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted thereon that the name of the applicant is printed "Herman Tamsky," address, 406 Massachusetts Avenue, city of Boston, Mass., the name of the committee is Boston Rosenberg-Sobell Committee," the occupation is printing.

Have you engaged in the printing business, or were so engaged in 1953?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. TAMSKY. Yes, not in business. I was employed in the printing trade, in 1953.

Mr. TAVENNER. The signature of the officer of the committee who signed this credential application is "Sue Koritz," secretary. Are you acquainted with Sue Koritz?

Mr. TAMSKY. I refuse to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment and my privilege under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. SCHERER. You are not a witness against yourself. We are asking you if you knew Sue Koritz.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Sue Koritz the executive secretary of the Boston Rosenberg-Sobell Committee?

Mr. TAMSKY. The same answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Sue Koritz known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. TAMSKY. The same answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I think that the record should show that the committee issued a subpoena for Miss Sue Koritz, but upon the receipt of a medical certificate from her doctor, relating to the family situation, her appearance was continued.

Chairman WALTER. Yes; I am aware of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have before me a photostatic copy of a typewritten statement of the conference schedule in Chicago, and included is this statement: "Nominations from the Chair for the following working service committees." Then follows this statement: "Political committees," and then the names of five persons appear as members of the political committees, and one of the names is that of Herman Tamsky, Boston.

Will you examine the document, please, and state whether or not you see the name "Herman Tamsky, Boston," as one of the members of the political committees?

(A document was handed to the witness.)

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. TAMSKY. I can't read very much of the title.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you any difficulty in reading the name "Herman Tamsky, Boston"?

Mr. TAMSKY. No; I don't have any difficulty in reading the name, "Herman Tamsky, Boston."

Mr. TAVENNER. It appears there, doesn't it?

Mr. TAMSKY. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. You do have difficulty in reading the title. You can see clearly the letters, "p-o-l-i," can you not?

Mr. TAMSKY. It looks like "police" to me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you serve on a "police" committee during this conference in Chicago?

Mr. TAMSKY. No, but I had some familiarity with Greek at one time, and I recognize the root of the word "p-o-l."

Mr. TAVENNER. You are uncertain as to what that meant?

Mr. TAMSKY. Definitely, it is obscured.

Mr. TAVENNER. What committee did you serve on?

Mr. TAMSKY. I refuse to answer on the same reason that I gave to your previous question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it on a "police" committee?

Mr. TAMSKY. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. There also appears the name "Dave Alman," of New York. Is that correct?

Mr. TAMSKY. I believe so, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know what position Dave Alman held in 1953 with the Rosenberg committee or with the national Rosenberg committee?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. TAMSKY. I decline to answer on the basis of my previous answer.

Chairman WALTER. At this point we will suspend, because the second bells rang and we must go over to the floor of the House. We will reconvene at 1 o'clock.

(Thereupon, the subcommittee recessed at 11:15 a. m., to reconvene at 1 p. m. the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION, AUGUST 2, 1955

Present: Representatives Walter (chairman), Willis, and Scherer.
Chairman WALTER. The hearing will come to order.

TESTIMONY OF HERMAN TAMSKY—Resumed

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Tamsky, at the time that the committee went into recess, I asked you whether or not the name of Dave Alman, of New York, appears on the document as one of those on the political or policy committee, as the case may be.

Mr. TAMSKY. I answered "Yes."

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you personally acquainted with Mr. Dave Alman?

Mr. TAMSKY. I refuse to answer under my rights of the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Another named on this committee is a person by the name of Dr. Tushnut, New Jersey; do you see that name appearing there?

Mr. TAMSKY. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether Dr. Tushnut is as stated there the same person as Dr. Leonard Tushnut, of Newark, N. J.?

Mr. TAMSKY. The same answer to the previous question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether Dr. Leonard Tushnut was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. TAMSKY. Same answer as I gave in the preceding question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, the staff endeavored to serve a subpoena upon Dr. Leonard Tushnut, of Newark, N. J., but at the time of issuance of the subpoena Dr. Tushnut was found to be in Europe. So, of course, the subpoena was not served. However, Dr. Tushnut has been identified in sworn testimony before this committee as having been a member of the Communist Party from at least the period of 1935 until the time that Dr. Tushnut entered the Armed Forces of

the United States in the early 1940's, and that while a member of the Communist Party was actively engaged in Communist-front work.

I now call your attention to the heading on another document entitled, "Organization and Finance." There appears under that heading this statement: "One person from Detroit." Do you know who from Detroit was designated a member of that organization and finance committee?

(Witness consults counsel.)

Mr. TAMSKY. I decline to answer on the previous basis.

Mr. TAVENNER. I point out to you the second name on the second statement on the list. It is the name Don Rothenberg. Do you see that name?

Mr. TAMSKY. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Don Rothenberg a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. TAMSKY. I decline to answer as previously.

Mr. TAVENNER. The next name under the organization and finance committee is Reid Robinson, Los Angeles. Do you know whether Reid Robinson was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. TAMSKY. I decline to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I think the record should show that Mr. Gitlow identified Reid Robinson as a member of the Communist Party in testimony given this committee on July 7, 1953.

Do you know whether Dr. Tushnet, of New Jersey, whose name you saw on this document, is chairman of the Rosenberg committee in the area of Newark, N. J.?

Mr. TAMSKY. I decline to answer for the same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. What was the last question?

Mr. TAVENNER. The question was does the witness know whether or not Dr. Tushnet, of New Jersey, is now chairman of the Rosenberg committee for the area of Newark, N. J.?

The last item appearing on the page is this "Report for the National Committee, Evaluation and Future Work, Emily Alman." Was Emily Alman in 1953 the executive secretary for the national committee for the clemency of the Rosenbergs?

(Witness consults with counsel.)

Mr. TAMSKY. Will you repeat that question?

Mr. TAVENNER. The last item appearing on the document is the report for the national committee, "Evaluation and Future Work, Emily Alman." I hand you the document. State whether or not you see that language at the end of the document.

Mr. TAMSKY. Yes; I see it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Emily Alman in 1953 the executive secretary of the national organization to secure justice in the Rosenberg case?

Mr. TAMSKY. That is a matter of public record.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us what that public record is with regard to her.

Mr. TAMSKY. That Emily Alman was a member of the national committee of the Rosenberg case, I believe.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the exact title of the national organization?

Mr. TAMSKY. I am not certain.

Mr. TAVENNER. There is no date on this.

Mr. SCHERER. He did not answer the question, Mr. Tavenner. He said it is a matter of public record. You asked him what the public record was, and then your attention was diverted. I think he should answer the question.

Mr. FORER. He did.

Mr. TAVENNER. I thought he did, but I may be mistaken.

Mr. FORER. If you want him to do it again, it is all right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer to be sure?

Mr. SCHERER. If he did, I didn't hear it.

Mr. FORER. The question is, You said it was a matter of public record that Emily Alman had what position with the Rosenberg committee. That is the question which you answered before, so please answer it again.

Mr. SCHERER. I cannot hear counsel if he is talking to the committee.

Mr. TAMSKY. I believe it is a matter of public record.

Mr. FORER. That—

Mr. SCHERER. That is not an answer. What is a matter of public record?

Mr. TAMSKY. That Emily Alman was a member of the committee for the clemency of the Rosenbergs.

Mr. SCHERER. That still does not answer. You asked him what position she held.

Mr. TAVENNER. I asked what official position she had with the national committee.

Mr. SCHERER. Witness, what official position did Emily Alman have with the national committee?

(Witness consults with counsel.)

Mr. TAMSKY. I believe it is a matter of public record that she was the executive secretary.

Mr. SCHERER. That still doesn't answer the question, Mr. Chairman. I asked him what position she did have. He says it is a matter of public record that she was the executive secretary. That doesn't answer the question.

Chairman WALTER. Maybe that is the only answer he can give. Do you know of your own knowledge what position she occupied?

(Witness consults with counsel.)

Mr. TAMSKY. I decline to answer for the reasons before stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Wasn't she elected executive secretary of the national organization at the meeting in Chicago at which the documents I have exhibited to you were used?

Mr. TAMSKY. I decline to answer for the reasons before stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Wasn't that convention in Chicago held on the 10th day of October 1953?

Mr. TAMSKY. I decline to answer for reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the name of the national organization changed at that convention so as to read "National Rosenberg-Sobell Committee"?

Mr. TAMSKY. I decline to answer for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell the committee, please, irrespective of any position that you may or may not have held with the Boston Committee for Justice to the Rosenbergs—that is, whether or not you prepared

leaflets or pamphlets for dissemination in the area of Boston based upon material issued by the national organization.

(Witness consults with counsel.)

Mr. TAMSKY. That is a pretty long question, Mr. Tavenner. Will you repeat it, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. I am not asking you what you did as an officer of the Boston committee; I am asking whether you, in any capacity, prepared leaflets or pamphlets—that is, wrote them—for dissemination in the area of Boston based upon information that had been put out by the national organization to secure justice for the Rosenbergs?

Mr. TAMSKY. I want to tell you that I felt that the Rosenberg case, and I still feel strong, was a horrible miscarriage of justice.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is not an answer to my question.

Mr. TAMSKY. I would gladly discuss the Rosenberg matter or the Rosenberg case, and the Sobell matter with you gentlemen if I was not here under oath.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer the question?

Mr. TAMSKY. But inasmuch as I am compelled to answer the question as you state it, I am going to refuse to answer on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. SCHERER. Would you be more inclined to tell the truth if you were discussing it with us when you were not under oath?

Mr. TAMSKY. I have not told any untruths.

Mr. SCHERER. I didn't ask you that question. You said you would be inclined to discuss it with us.

Mr. TAMSKY. I would gladly discuss it with you if I was not under oath, yes. I would be proud to.

Mr. SCHERER. Would you expect me to believe you then?

Mr. TAMSKY. I certainly think it is an awful situation where the Senate Judiciary Committee has been petitioned to investigate this horrible miscarriage of justice, that you gentleman should be spending time with me over here at this time.

Chairman WALTER. Are you sure that proposal for investigation has not been inspired because of the hearings we are holding?

Mr. TAMSKY. I didn't get that question.

Chairman WALTER. Never mind. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether or not the Civil Rights Congress in Boston was active in any manner in the work of the Boston committee for the clemency of the Rosenbergs.

Mr. TAMSKY. I can say there were many different groups interested in the Rosenberg case. I am declining to answer your specific question on the basis that I declined to answer other questions.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

Chairman WALTER. The witness is directed to answer the question.

Mr. TAMSKY. I decline to answer on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is your refusal to answer based upon the fact that you were the chairman of the Boston chapter of the Civil Rights Congress?

Mr. TAMSKY. Do you want to repeat that question?

Mr. TAVENNER. Read the question, please.

(Question read by the reporter.)

(Witness consults with counsel.)

Mr. TAMSKY. I refuse to answer for the same reasons as in the past.

Mr. SCHERER. Were you chairman of the Boston chapter, Civil Rights Congress?

Mr. TAMSKY. I abide by my original refusal on this question.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that the witness be directed to answer the question.

Chairman WALTER. You are directed to answer.

Mr. TAMSKY. I refuse to answer on the basis that I have given before.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a photostatic copy of the March 26, 1952, issue of the Daily Worker, and call your attention to an article entitled, "Anti-Smith Act Rally in Boston."

Mr. TAMSKY. May I see it?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, in a second. I will describe the article a little more fully. It is stated, "The meeting conducted by Otis Hood, chairman of the Massachusetts Communist Party, collected money for Charney's defense. Other speakers included Phil Koritz, chairman of the chapter of the Civil Rights Congress." That would appear that Mr. Koritz was the chairman rather than you. Was Mr. Koritz chairman of the Civil Rights Congress in 1952?

Mr. TAMSKY. I decline to answer on the basis that I used in the past.

Mr. TAVENNER. What position in the Civil Rights Congress did you hold?

(Witness consults with counsel.)

Mr. TAMSKY. I decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you in the city of Washington on January 5, 1953?

(Witness consults with counsel.)

Mr. TAMSKY. Can you identify the occasion of my being in Washington on that date?

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you in the city of Washington in January 1953?

Mr. TAMSKY. Washington, January 1953?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. TAMSKY. That is much too vague a question. I decline to answer on the basis that I have used before.

Mr. WILLIS. Do you object on the ground of vagueness or on other grounds?

Mr. TAMSKY. What?

Mr. WILLIS. Are you objecting to answering because the question is too vague, or are you objecting on some other ground?

Mr. TAMSKY. I am objecting on the ground that I have used for the previous questions.

Mr. FORER. And also he added vagueness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you make any trip to the city of Washington in January 1953, in behalf of the Boston Committee To Secure Clemency in the Rosenberg Case?

(Witness consults with counsel.)

Mr. TAMSKY. I refuse to answer on the same basis.

Chairman WALTER. I notice, Mr. Tavenner, in what purports to be a statement by some certified public accountants, an item on delegation to Washington, railroads, and so forth, \$57,859.09. Is that the sort of thing you are trying to get into?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALTER. It is very significant to note that while they spent nearly \$58,000 for traveling for delegations, they spent only \$1,299 for the welfare of the Rosenberg children. Let us find out about this delegation.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of a delegation from the Boston Committee To Secure Clemency in the Rosenberg Case which came to Washington?

Mr. TAMSKY. I decline to answer on the basis that I have used previously.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have any part in the raising of money for the Boston Committee To Secure Clemency in the Rosenberg Case? (Witness consults with counsel.)

Mr. TAMSKY. I decline to answer on the basis that I have used before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a member of the Civil Rights Congress in Boston?

Mr. TAMSKY. I decline to answer on the basis that I have used previously.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you received any salary or compensation of any character from the Boston Committee To Secure Clemency in the Rosenberg Case?

(Witness consults with counsel.)

Mr. FORER. Will you explain what you mean by the word "compensation"?

Mr. TAVENNER. I think the witness certainly knows what compensation means. Whether he has been paid anything.

Mr. FORER. Whether he has been paid anything?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. FORER. That would include payment of expenses.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let him explain what it is if he did receive anything.

Mr. TAMSKY. I decline to answer on the basis that I have used previously.

Mr. TAVENNER. That there may be no misunderstanding about your answer; did you receive any salary from the Boston committee?

(Witness consults with counsel.)

Mr. TAMSKY. No; I didn't receive any salary from the Boston committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then what was the nature of the compensation which you received?

(Witness consults with counsel.)

Mr. TAMSKY. It sounds like a loaded question to me, Mr. Tavenner. I decline to answer on the basis I used previously.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WALTER. Have you any questions, Mr. Willis?

Mr. WILLIS. No, sir.

Chairman WALTER. Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. Did you ask him if he knew Mr. Donald Rothenberg, of Cleveland?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir; I asked him that.

Mr. SCHERER. What was his answer?

Mr. TAVENNER. His answer was to refuse to answer.

Mr. SCHERER. Will you turn around, Mr. Witness, and look at the gentleman in the second row?

Mr. TAMSKY. Are you directing me to look behind myself and finger anybody?

Mr. SCHERER. Will you look around?

(Witness consults with counsel.)

Mr. FORER. Is it the direction of the committee that he look around?

Chairman WALTER. No.

Mr. TAMSKY. I thought you could direct me to come to Washington. I didn't know you could direct me to turn around and point people out in the room.

Chairman WALTER. I ask you if you will look around and see if you know the man in the second row. You are not under any compulsion to do it.

Mr. FORER. Could we have that repeated?

Chairman WALTER. I am asking him if he will turn around and see if he recognizes the man in the second row on the aisle.

Mr. FORER. Is this a question or just a request?

Chairman WALTER. No, I am merely asking him if he will look and then I am asking him if having looked, if he recognizes him.

Mr. FORER. You are asking him if he knows the man on the second row?

Chairman WALTER. Yes; that is right.

(Witness and counsel turn around and look.)

Chairman WALTER. On the aisle, I said, blue suit, polka dot tie.

Mr. FORER. What is the question, whether he knows him or not?

Mr. TAMSKY. Yes; I know him.

Chairman WALTER. Now look across the aisle and tell me if you know that man across the aisle.

Mr. TAMSKY. I was introduced to him casually.

Chairman WALTER. What is his name?

Mr. TAMSKY. The name slipped my mind, as a matter of fact.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you know Mr. Donald Rothenberg?

Mr. TAMSKY. Yes; I have met Mr. Rothenberg.

Mr. SCHERER. Is that Mr. Rothenberg sitting on the aisle in the second row?

Mr. TAMSKY. Yes, I believe so.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you know Mr. Rothenberg to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. TAMSKY. I decline to answer for the same reasons I have given before.

Chairman WALTER. Is there anything further, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Chairman WALTER. That is all.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

Chairman WALTER. Call your next witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Philip Koritz.

Chairman WALTER. Do you swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. KORITZ. I do.

**TESTIMONY OF PHILIP KORITZ, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL,
JOSEPH FORER**

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you Mr. Philip Koritz?

Mr. KORITZ. That is right. K-o-r-i-t-z.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted you are accompanied by counsel. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. FORER. Joseph Forer, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were you born, Mr. Koritz?

Mr. KORITZ. In the east side in New York City.

Mr. TAVENNER. What date?

Mr. KORITZ. March 20, 1917.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation?

Mr. KORITZ. I am a salesman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, how you have been employed since 1950?

Mr. KORITZ. I don't remember this to be exact. I think I have worked for a packing house. I worked for the Allis Chalmers Co. I worked for various sales organizations and possibly some others.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you lived in any place other than the State of Massachusetts?

Mr. KORITZ. Yes, I have.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where?

Mr. KORITZ. Would you ask me the particular places? Excuse me. (Witness consults with counsel.)

Mr. FORER. Do you want to do that?

Mr. KORITZ. I think it is just as easy that way as me telling you where I lived.

Mr. TAVENNER. No, I would like you to tell me where you have lived.

(Witness consults with counsel.)

Mr. KORITZ. I was in an awful lot of places.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell us where you lived in 1945.

Mr. KORITZ. That means 1946 on?

Mr. TAVENNER. 1945 on.

Mr. KORITZ. I lived in California.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over what period?

Mr. KORITZ. In 1945, since you said 1945.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where in California?

Mr. KORITZ. San Francisco.

Mr. TAVENNER. How were you employed there?

Mr. KORITZ. I worked for the Utility Workers Organizing Committee, CIO.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your next employment?

Mr. KORITZ. My next employment was working for the Food and Tobacco Workers of the Food, Tobacco, Agricultural, and Allied Workers of America Union, CIO.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where?

Mr. KORITZ. North Carolina.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you live in North Carolina? Where was your work while there?

Mr. KORITZ. Winston-Salem, N. C.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you become acquainted with Ann Matthews at Winston-Salem, N. C.?

Mr. KORITZ. I am going to say at this time that I resent my association of myself with any type of stoolie or any type of person in that category, and I refuse to answer that question on the basis of the privilege granted to me under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you become a director of local 22 of the Food, Tobacco, Agricultural and Allied Workers of America, CIO, in Winston-Salem?

Mr. KORITZ. I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was that?

Mr. KORITZ. That was in 1946.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you in Winston-Salem?

Mr. KORITZ. Approximately 1 year.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the approximate date when you left North Carolina?

Mr. KORITZ. I was in North Carolina twice.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the date you left the first time?

Mr. KORITZ. Approximately January 1947.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you return to North Carolina?

Mr. KORITZ. In November—I think it was November 1947.

Mr. TAVENNER. For what purpose?

Mr. KORITZ. I think this is about the first time I have had an opportunity to actually explain that particular purpose, and I am going to welcome the opportunity to explain it.

I was the director of the food and tobacco workers local union in North Carolina. We were carrying on a strike at that time to improve the wages and conditions of employment of the people in those particular plants. This strike took place after a long period of negotiations.

During the period of the strike, in my opinion, there was an attempt to frame us on the basis of the police breaking the picket line. I appeared on the picket line, not having been there at the time they broke it, and asked what happened. On proceeding from there to my office to attempt to arrange counsel for the people who had been arrested I noticed that a Negro man was lying on the ground and proceeded over there, and there were police around that man.

I made inquiries as to that man because he was not on strike, he was not in the area where the picket-line incident took place, and he worked in another plant which was under contract to our union.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment.

Mr. KORITZ. I attempted to make this known to the police, and I was arrested and we were all tried, and I was sentenced to the chain gang for 1 year after appeal. We appealed that case to the United States Supreme Court on the basis of systematic exclusion of Negroes from the jury. It was denied by the Court, since they had not had a case of that type up before it.

While I was in prison, the Court reversed in a similar petition on, I think, a vote of 8 to 1, saying that there was systematic exclusion of Negroes from the jury.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have told us——

Mr. KORITZ. I was there until March 1948.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have told us what occurred after you got there. Now will you answer my question and tell us what your purpose was in returning to North Carolina?

Mr. KORITZ. My purpose was to serve my sentence.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was the purpose?

Mr. KORITZ. That is right. As a matter of fact, I was in contact with the sheriff's office, and when he told me that the Court had ruled, and so forth, and I was to begin my sentence, I left the area I was in and took a plane and reported at 11 o'clock that evening to serve my sentence with the other victims of what I consider a vicious frameup.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were sentenced during your first trip to North Carolina.

Mr. KORITZ. That is right. That is when the strike took place.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party during the period that you were director of Local 22, Food, Tobacco, Agricultural, and Allied Workers, CIO, in Winston-Salem, N. C.?

Mr. KORITZ. I refuse to answer that question on my previous grounds, on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. KORITZ. Same grounds, or same answer. I think you understand.

Mr. TAVENNER. After March 1948 where did you live?

Mr. KORITZ. As I recall, I was in the chain gang in 1948 until approximately March. From there I went to Missouri. I lived in Missouri and thereabouts—I was in the jurisdiction of Missouri in a sense—from then until the latter part of 1948.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your business or employment in Missouri?

Mr. KORITZ. I worked for the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you so employed?

Mr. KORITZ. I think I originally went to work for them in 1947 in July. I am not absolutely sure of that date. Then I went to that chain gang, and then I worked for them when I got out in Missouri until approximately the end of October 1948.

Mr. TAVENNER. What position did you hold with the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers?

Mr. KORITZ. I was an organizer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party during that period of time?

Mr. KORITZ. I refuse to answer that question on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the next place of your residence?

Mr. KORITZ. Boston, Mass.

Mr. TAVENNER. About what date did you move to Boston?

Mr. KORITZ. I came there in approximately the end of October or the beginning of November 1948.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you lived there continuously?

Mr. KORITZ. Yes, sir, I have.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you president or chairman of the Boston chapter of the Civil Rights Congress while living in Boston in 1952?

Mr. KORITZ. I think ever since I was in high school, you know—educated in high school under the great traditions of our country—and

I have been interested in civil rights of myself and all people. I have done a great deal or as much as I possibly could under the circumstances to fight for and promote and advance civil and democratic rights. However, I am going to have to decline to answer that question on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment, not to be a witness against myself. While I say I was not the greatest fighter or the only fighter, I am just saying I was one of the men who loved this country.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you sufficiently interested in the work of the Civil Rights Congress to become its chairman?

Mr. KORITZ. I just declined to answer that question, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. FORER. For the same reason.

Mr. KORITZ. For the same reason. I think that is understood. If there is any question, I would like to have the gentleman ask me to make sure that is my reason because I might forget.

Mr. TAVENNER. To your knowledge, did the Boston chapter of the Civil Rights Congress have anything to do with the establishment of the Boston Committee To Secure Clemency in the Rosenberg Case, acting as an organization or through its members?

(Witness consults counsel.)

Mr. KORITZ. I decline to answer that question on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you participate in the work of that Boston committee for the clemency of the Rosenbergs?

Mr. KORITZ. Well, finally we are sort of getting to the Rosenbergs which I understood was the purpose that you arranged this hearing.

Chairman WALTER. Will you answer the question, please?

Mr. KORITZ. On the Rosenbergs I would consider one of the most vicious frameups that mankind ever saw—

Chairman WALTER. I am sure you feel that way.

Mr. KORITZ. I sure do, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WALTER. Answer the question, please.

(Witness consulted his counsel.)

Mr. KORITZ. I decline to answer that question for the reasons stated before. I think it was a tragedy in our time to have such a thing take place.

Chairman WALTER. No, you don't at all. You are not kidding anyone.

Mr. KORITZ. I certainly do.

Chairman WALTER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. SCHERER. Such a tragedy, and he refuses to tell us whether he was connected with it or not.

Mr. KORITZ. I don't see you being concerned about the two orphans.

Mr. SCHERER. I was very much concerned about them.

Mr. KORITZ. At least the chairman came out for clemency. I am not sure.

Chairman WALTER. You are not sure, but I will straighten you out now. No.

Mr. KORITZ. I think it was in the paper. I am not sure.

Chairman WALTER. What paper? The Daily Worker?

Mr. KORITZ. I am going to decline on the same grounds.

Chairman WALTER. That is understood, of course.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee to what extent, if any, the Communist Party promoted or assisted in any propaganda work of the Boston committee for the clemency of the Rosenbergs?

Mr. KORITZ. Mr. Tavenner, even when I was in jail the one thing that was the most despicable thing even among some of these people who did commit some kind of crimes was the informer. I am not an informer.

Mr. TAVENNER. You know but you won't tell.

Mr. KORITZ. I am not an informer and I am not going to incriminate myself either.

Mr. SCHERER. Are you refusing to answer because as you said you don't want to be an informer? Is that the reason you are refusing to answer?

Mr. KORITZ. I refuse to answer because I would not let this committee make me an informer but also because if I answered I would be waiving my privilege, and my privilege is not to answer, guaranteed to me under the fifth amendment not to be forced to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you go as a delegate or representative from the Boston Committee To Secure Clemency in the Rosenberg Case to Washington to take part in any demonstration in January 1953?

(Witness consults his counsel.)

Mr. KORITZ. I was for clemency. However, I decline to answer that question on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. SCHERER. You mean it would incriminate you, although you were for clemency?

Mr. KORITZ. I said not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. SCHERER. Let me finish, Witness. You say you were for clemency, and yet you say it would incriminate you if you told us whether or not you were one of those who came to Washington on behalf of clemency for the Rosenbergs?

Mr. KORITZ. I don't recall that was the question.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you come to Washington on behalf of clemency for the Rosenbergs?

(Witness consults his counsel.)

Mr. KORITZ. I decline to answer that question on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. The fact is that you were one of many who came.

Mr. KORITZ. I refuse on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Weren't you a member of the Communist Party and came with a lot of other members of the Communist Party to Washington?

Mr. KORITZ. I decline to answer that question on the basis of the fifth—

Mr. SCHERER. And wasn't that trip controlled and dominated by the Communist Party?

Mr. KORITZ. You may have your opinion. I have my opinions. But I decline to answer.

Mr. SCHERER. Is my opinion wrong?

Mr. KORITZ. I decline to answer the question.

Mr. SCHERER. You said I may have my opinion. Is the opinion I expressed true or false?

Mr. KORITZ. Are you asking me a question?

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that the witness be directed to answer.

Chairman WALTER. You are directed to answer the question.

Mr. FORER. Do you know what the question is?

Mr. KORITZ. No. What is the question?

Chairman WALTER. "Is my opinion as to the Rosenbergs true or false?"

Mr. SCHERER. That is right.

Mr. KORITZ. Is that the question? Is my opinion as to the Rosenbergs—

Chairman WALTER. Mr. Scherer's opinion.

Mr. KORITZ. What is your opinion as to the Rosenbergs?

Chairman WALTER. Let us get this straight.

Mr. SCHERER. My first question to you was whether it is not a fact that you, along with a lot of other Communists, came to Washington on behalf of clemency for the Rosenbergs, and wasn't it a fact that the delegation was completely controlled and dominated by the Communist Party.

Mr. KORITZ. I decline to answer that question on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. It is my opinion that it was. You said before that may be my opinion. I wanted to know whether that opinion I have is true or false.

(Witness consults his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Chairman WALTER. Mr. Willis?

Mr. WILLIS. No questions.

Chairman WALTER. The witness is excused.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

Mr. KORITZ. May I ask Mr. Scherer a question?

Chairman WALTER. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to recall Mr. Tamsky for 1 or 2 questions.

Chairman WALTER. Mr. Tamsky, you will resume the stand, please.

TESTIMONY OF HERMAN TAMSKY—Resumed

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Tamsky, in light of the sworn testimony this committee has received, I think I should ask you pointedly the question as to whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party at any time since 1952.

Mr. TAMSKY. I decline to answer that question, on the basis of the fifth amendment as I used it before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at any time prior to 1952?

Mr. TAMSKY. The same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. TAMSKY. The same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Chairman WALTER. Call your next witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Don Rothenberg.

Chairman WALTER. Raise your right hand. Do you swear that the testimony you give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I do.

**TESTIMONY OF DON ROTHENBERG, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL,
JOSEPH FORER**

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. My name is Don Rothenberg.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell your name, please?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. R-o-t-h-e-n-b-e-r-g. First name, D-o-n.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted that you are accompanied by the same counsel who accompanied the preceding witness.

When and where were you born, Mr. Rothenberg?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Mr. Tavenner and Mr. Congressman, I would like to read a short statement.

Chairman WALTER. No; you are not going to read any statement. Just answer the questions you are asked. When and where were you born?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Mr. Walter, I was subpoenaed here——

Chairman WALTER. That is right, you were subpoenaed here to answer some questions, and now answer them.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Without any knowledge——

Chairman WALTER. Mr. Tavenner, proceed.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Without any knowledge of the subject of the hearing.

Chairman WALTER. You know all about it. I read the purpose when the hearing opened this morning.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. That is correct, and I have since prepared the statement.

Chairman WALTER. Never mind your statement.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your name?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I stated my name.

Mr. TAVENNER. And your place of birth.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I was born in New York City.

Mr. TAVENNER. What date?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. July 19, 1924.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I attended the public schools in New York City. I graduated from high school and went to Brooklyn College, which is a free city college in the city of New York until 1943, when I enlisted in the Army. I returned from service and completed by education in the Nation's Capital at George Washington University.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you return from service?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I was discharged in November 1945.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you enter George Washington University?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I can't tell you the exact date. It was probably in February of 1946 since the college term usually begins in February.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what field of educational work did you enter?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I was a major in political science. That was my major.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many years did you attend George Washington University?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I believe I stated, Mr. Tavenner, that I graduated in August of 1947, which would mean that I attended approximately a year and a half. It was during that time that my interest in justice for all persons was heightened, and it is for that reason, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to request that you allow me to read my statement.

Chairman WALTER. Was it then that you joined the Communist Party?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. May I read my statement?

Chairman WALTER. You are not going to read the statement at all. I have asked you a question.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Aren't you interested in facts in this case?

Chairman WALTER. I am interested in facts.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I would like to give you a book, then.

Chairman WALTER. Never mind that, I don't read that drivel.

Mr. TAVENNER. I ask that he answer the question.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. It is apparent, Mr. Chairman, that you are not interested in facts.

Chairman WALTER. I am interested in facts, but not the——

Mr. ROTHENBERG. You are interested in trying——

Chairman WALTER. Never mind. Answer my question. Was it then that you joined the Communist Party?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. There are 4 million people who expressed themselves on that case.

Chairman WALTER. Was it then that you joined the Communist Party?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Mr. Chairman——

Chairman WALTER. Was it?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. In view of your obvious attempt to show a lack of concern, lack of interest in a basic principle of free speech, free assemblage, the right of a citizen of this country to petition his Congress for a redress of grievances, and in view of the obvious intent of this committee not to look into the facts of this case, and in view of the protection which was inserted into our Constitution by our Founding Fathers for exactly this type of situation, Mr. Walter, I refuse to answer your question under the privilege granted to me by the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

(Mr. Willis left the hearing room.)

Mr. SCHERER. You said you wanted to know whether we are interested in facts, and the very first fact we are interested in, and the most important fact we are interested in, is your membership in the Communist Party. You have a chance to tell us under oath about that fact, and you refuse.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Mr. Congressman, it seems to me that there was a refusal even before mine, and that was the refusal of Mr. Walter to read a book which is fully documented, 672 pages, which a man worked 3 years to produce and it exposes the entire framework of the Rosenberg-Sobell case. I ask you as a Congressman who happens to be from my home State to at least have the decency to read the book.

Mr. SCHERER. I will read the book if you will tell us if you are a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Mr. Congressman, I think that any person who has observed the hearings of this committee would not make a deal with this committee. I don't come to you to make deals. I come to you as one of my representatives from my State——

Chairman WALTER. To give us facts.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. That is correct, sir.

Chairman WALTER. Now we are starting on the proper basis. Give us facts. Now, are you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Well——

Chairman WALTER. I thought we were going to talk about facts.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I thought we were, too, sir. I had no idea why I was subpoenaed here.

Chairman WALTER. You will find out if you answer the questions. I am sure you will make a great contribution to the matter with which we are concerned.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I am attempting to make such a contribution, Congressman.

Chairman WALTER. Never mind. You are not very funny. Mr. Tavenner wants to ask some questions.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I assure you, Mr. Walter, I don't intend to be funny. This is a very serious matter. This involves a couple that was executed.

Chairman WALTER. You have no more interest in that than you have in the man in the moon.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I resent that statement, Mr. Congressman.

Chairman WALTER. I don't care whether you do or don't.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I resent it and I ask you to withdraw it from the record.

Chairman WALTER. I am not going to withdraw——

Mr. ROTHENBERG. How dare you impugn my motives?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Rothenberg, the book to which you referred was Judgment of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, by John Wexley, was it not?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. FORER. Have you read it?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I am glad to see that you recognize it.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is a book written from the Communist Party point of view of the issues involved.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Have you read the book, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. I have examined the book.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Have you read the book? Have you read the documents? Can you prove one lie in this book? I dare you to prove it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer the question?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. You can't. You are not interested in the facts.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is by John Wexley, and it is a presentation of the Communist Party point of view, is it not?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I ask any objective person in this room whether he be a reporter or not to read the book and form his own opinion.

Chairman WALTER. Answer the question.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Will you repeat the question?

Chairman WALTER. Read the question, please.

(Question read by the reporter.)

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I think it is an objective presentation of the facts in this case, and it is by John Wexley.

Mr. SCHERER. I submit he has not answered the question.

Chairman WALTER. Just answer the question.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask you to direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. FORER. He did.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I think I answered that question.

Chairman WALTER. Never mind. Mr. Tavenner will ask the next question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know that Mr. John Wexley has been identified before this committee as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Is your question do I know that Mr. Wexley has been identified? Are you stating at what time and what person identified Mr. Wexley?

Mr. TAVENNER. No; but I will if your recollection needs refreshing.

Chairman WALTER. I don't think that is necessary. Do you know whether or not he is a member of the Communist Party?

(No response.)

Chairman WALTER. Do you?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I will refuse to answer that question, Mr. Walter, on the basis of the——

Mr. SCHERER. There are two facts we wanted that we have not gotten from this witness.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. May I complete my answer?

Chairman WALTER. You have answered the question. You say you refuse to answer because of the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Please don't put words in my mouth. It is difficult as it is. I would like to complete my answer.

Chairman WALTER. Ask the next question.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I think I have the right to give the reasons for refusing to answer.

Chairman WALTER. You have refused to answer and given the reasons. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be well for the record to show at this point the identification of Mr. John Wexley as a member of the Communist Party in sworn testimony before this committee. He has been identified by Martin Berkeley in testimony on September 19, 1951; by Mr. Robert Rossin on May 7, 1953; by Judith Raymond, testimony of September 11, 1953; by David A. Lang, March 24, 1953; Pauline Townsend, testimony of March 12, 1953.

Chairman WALTER. Has he been subpoenaed?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Chairman WALTER. Why not?

Mr. TAVENNER. I don't know.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Subpena everyone who writes a book, Congressman.

Chairman WALTER. No; we will subpoena everybody who writes a Communist book.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. You won't even read it and you say it is a Communist book. You are adjourning today. You will have time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Testimony of Bart Lytton on March 26, 1953; Edward Dmytryk, May 25, 1951; Leo Townsend, testimony of September 18, 1951; Max Silver, by testimony of January 23, 1952.

Mr. SCHERER. How many witnesses identified him as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. May I point out——

Chairman WALTER. No; there is no question before you. We will get around to some facts in a minute.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Rothenberg, you refused to answer the question whether or not you became a member of the Communist Party while you were in attendance at George Washington University. Did you become acquainted with Mary Stalcup Markward while you were at George Washington University?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Mary Stalcup Markward, is that correct?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mary Stalcup Markward.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I see. That was a long time ago. That was at least 8 years ago.

Mr. SCHERER. You had your recollection refreshed about this woman just last year at Dayton, Ohio, Mr. Rothenberg; so it was not 8 years ago.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. That is, when I attended George Washington University was the question that was asked of me, Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. Yes; but just last year we talked at length.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. You mean in the hearing room I was called without the benefit of counsel. You mean that one? When I was subpoenaed in the hearing room when you were chairman of the committee?

Mr. SCHERER. That is right.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I thought you would remember.

Mr. SCHERER. I remember very well.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. So do I, Congressman.

Chairman WALTER. Now that your memory is so good, do you remember Mary Stalcup Markward?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I decline to answer that question on my privileges under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Eleanor Driesen in the city of Washington while you were a student at George Washington University?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. It might save time, to tell you that these questions seem to be similar to questions that you asked me in Dayton last year. You know the answers that I gave then on principle, not out of any fear, but on principle, and I would repeat my answer at this time. You have no right to ask me that question.

Chairman WALTER. Answer the question. Do you know this woman or not?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I decline to answer the question on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. SCHERER. I have a question while he is mentioning Dayton. During the time that you were testifying in Dayton you spoke at Antioch University, did you not?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. You mean Antioch College?

Mr. SCHERER. Well, college.

(Witness consults his counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. Let us ask the question this way.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I hope you realize, Congressman, why seemingly simple questions require some thought before this committee. I did speak at Antioch College.

Mr. SCHERER. You spoke at Antioch College on the very night of the day that you took the fifth amendment before the committee at Dayton, did you not?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. No, sir; I don't believe that is correct. As I remember it, I spoke on a Monday night. Your committee had issued a subpoena to me Monday at 2 o'clock in the afternoon while I was sitting in the hearing room, and Tuesday morning at about 11 o'clock you issued a second subpoena to me. As I remember it, I testified 15 minutes after you issued me the subpoena.

Mr. SCHERER. When did you speak at Antioch College?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. To the best of my recollection it was the previous evening, Monday night. I don't want to be held to it, but that is my recollection of the sequence of events.

Mr. SCHERER. My question is, Who asked you to speak at Antioch College during those hearings?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I honestly can't remember.

Mr. SCHERER. To whom did you talk?

(Witness consults his counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. Before what group?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Pardon?

Mr. SCHERER. Before what group of the college did you talk?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Would you like to hear what I had to say at that time?

Mr. SCHERER. No.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I didn't think you would.

Mr. SCHERER. What you said was in the newspaper.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. You have now invaded a new area of free assembly, Mr. Scherer. I don't know how many other aspects of the Constitution you are going to attempt to take care of in one afternoon.

Chairman WALTER. Answer the question: To whom did you speak? What group was it? That is a simple question.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I think I will decline to answer that question on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Chairman WALTER. Who invited you to come to the college to speak?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. And because I think it is a violation of free speech.

Chairman WALTER. Who invited you to come to the college to speak?

(Witness consults his counsel.)

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I think I answered that just a few moments ago, Mr. Walter.

Chairman WALTER. I was not listening.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I honestly don't remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mary Stalcup Markward testified before the committee on June 11, 1951, as follows [reading]:

Mr. OWENS. With regard to the students or students whom you have identified, are there any other students in the Washington area whom you can recall as having been members of the Communist Party during your membership therein?

I should add at this point that Mary Stalcup Markward was an undercover operative for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and

had joined the Communist Party and had risen at this time to the position of treasurer of the Communist Party in the city of Washington.

Her reply was:

There was an individual student recruited at George Washington University who was acutely security conscious at the time he was recruited, and was not associated with the students' club as such. That was Donald Rothenberg. He was sponsored by Eleanor Driesen who at that time was functionary for a Spanish aid committee, I believe at 802 F Street.

Mr. OWENS. Has she been previously identified by you as a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. MARKWARD. I believe not. She should have been.

Mr. OWENS. Will you identify her now?

Mrs. MARKWARD. She was a member of the industrial club, immediately after the reorganization of the Communist Party and then she transferred to the community club, and she transferred to Chicago around 1947.

Mr. OWENS. Continue about Mr. Rothenberg.

Mrs. MARKWARD. I was asked by Eleanor Driesen as city secretary to come to her office to interview Don Rothenberg whom she highly recommended as a reputable person who should be a party member. He agreed to join the Communist Party providing his membership would not be known to other than the very top leadership of the party.

Mr. OWENS. Was this in your presence?

Mrs. MARKWARD. This was in my presence as an official of the party. I was there to see if he could get such an agreement from the party. I was to decide whether the party would accept him under those conditions. I am certain his chairmanship of the AVC—

which means American Veterans Committee—

had something to do with the question but I was not certain it was the whole reason. I discussed this with William Taylor, and it was agreed that Don Rothenberg should be a member and pay dues as a member at large and not belong to a club. It is my recollection that after that time he was assigned to the community club.

Were you a member at large of the Communist Party while you attended George Washington University as testified by Mrs. Markward?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Mr. Tavenner, two people were executed on the basis of perjured testimony. Don't you understand that?

Chairman WALTER. Will you answer the question, please? Were you a member of the Communist Party during the period specified?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I must refuse to answer that question on the basis of my privilege granted to me under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. SCHERER. Was the testimony that Mr. Tavenner just read to you by Mrs. Markward true or false, particularly as it referred to you?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Mr. Scherer, you know that is the same question. Are you trying to trap me? Is that your purpose?

Mr. SCHERER. No; you are too smart to be trapped.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Thank you very much, Mr. Scherer. I appreciate the compliment.

Mr. SCHERER. Will you answer the question?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. What is the question?

Mr. SCHERER. Is the testimony that Mr. Tavenner read, the testimony of Mrs. Markward, true or false, particularly as that testimony refers to you.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. It seems to me that I have answered that question which was worded in a slightly different way just a moment ago.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that the witness be directed to answer the question.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I decline to answer the question, Mr. Scherer, on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Rothenberg, after you left Washington in 1947, or after you completed your course, how did you become employed?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. In view of the line of questioning that has been developed so far, and in view of your lack of interest in the facts of this case, which you are supposedly investigating today—

Chairman WALTER. How do you know what we are investigating? A moment ago you said you didn't know what you came here for. But you came here with a whole boxful of material.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I said when I received my subpoena, Mr. Walter, and I will show it to you, it has nothing but my name on it.

Chairman WALTER. You said you didn't know what you were coming here for. You came prepared with a whole boxful of material.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I should correct my statement, Congressman. I didn't know at the time I was subpoenaed why I was being called, and it was not until I read an article in a newspaper that hearings were taking place at this time that I thought it might be on this subject and for that reason I come prepared with the things which have brought me to my conviction on the Rosenberg-Sobell case.

(Mr. Forer left the room.)

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I have read the court record. It is right here. There are Members of Congress who have read the court record, and a number of them I understand have great doubts about the guilt of the Rosenbergs. Why don't you read the court record? You are an attorney, Mr. Walter.

Chairman WALTER. Mr. Tavenner, will you proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. May we have a 5-minute recess?

(Short recess.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside, Mr. Rothenberg?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I live in Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in Cleveland?

Mr. SCHERER. Eight years.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Do you have to answer, Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. I have just been reading your testimony.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. The answer is 7 years, not 8 years, Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. A year ago you said you were living there 8 years, so it ought to be 9.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I said I came there in May 17, 1948. I believe that is 7 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that the date when you went to Cleveland?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Yes, that is my recollection.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your present occupation or profession?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Mr. Tavenner, I decline to answer that question on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you the State director of the Progressive Party for the State of Ohio?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. As you know, you place a witness in a very difficult position. You are aware of that. I will decline to answer

that question for good and sufficient reasons and because of my privilege under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you had any official connection with the Cleveland Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case, or a similar committee?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I live in Cleveland. I have taken a great personal interest in the Rosenberg case as has Dr. Urey, His Holiness, the Pope, Albert Einstein, Chief Cardinal of France——

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. And I said myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your connection with that organization in Cleveland?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I didn't say that I had a connection with that organization in Cleveland.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have a connection with it?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I will decline to answer that question under the fifth amendment which includes my privilege not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend a convention of that national organization in the city of Chicago where you were appointed by the chairman to a position on the organization and finance committee?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Of which organization?

Mr. TAVENNER. The national organization for the defense of the Rosenbergs.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I stated before that I took a great personal interest in the Rosenberg-Sobell case. I think I have indicated that interest rather strongly today. I hope not too strongly. But I will decline that particular question on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Weren't you an active participant in the national organization as early as 1953?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I read the court record, I believe, in 1953.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is not responsive to my question.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. As far as that specific question is concerned, I will decline to answer it on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who is the president of the national organization?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. President?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Of the national organization that you referred to in previous questions?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I will again decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. You will not tell the committee the name of its president?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I will give my answer, Mr. Tavenner. I will decline to answer that question because I don't think that you are seriously interested in what was actually done to try to save the Rosenbergs. I think you are trying to overlook the fact that 4 million people in this country expressed themselves——

Chairman WALTER. We are not trying the Rosenbergs. We are interested in something entirely different. The Supreme Court of the United States passed on the validity of the proceedings in that par-

ticular case. We are not concerned with the book that you bring in here, published by some Communist publishers and written by a Communist; we are not concerned with that. We want to know something entirely different. We are not trying the Rosenbergs. They have been tried, they have been convicted, and their conviction sustained. Nobody in the history of jurisprudence anywhere in the world had their case examined any more carefully than was the case with the Rosenbergs.

Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Mr. Congressman, do you know the statement you made on the day of the execution of the Rosenbergs? Do you know you objected to the Supreme Court overruling Justice Douglas' stay? Shall I produce the clipping containing your statement concerning the act of 1925?

Chairman WALTER. No. I will not admit it.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. You won't admit it. I will show it to you.

Mr. TAVENNER. We of course are not attempting to review the decision. What we are attempting to do is to ascertain facts regarding Communist Party participation in the matter if there was such.

Chairman WALTER. More than that, we are interested in ascertaining to what extent this cause célèbre was used by the Communists to further their own interests.

Mr. TAVENNER. Precisely.

Chairman WALTER. Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have before me an excerpt from the Daily Worker of September 18, 1953, entitled, "5,000 at Rally Pledge Fight for New Trial for Sobell."

In the last paragraph appears this statement: "Other speakers were Prof. Ephraim Cross and Don Rothenberg, the committee's Washington representative."

Were you correctly noted here as the Sobell committee's Washington representative?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I am proud of everything I did to try to prevent an injustice against the Rosenbergs and Martin Sobell. I would not take back one word or one act.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was not my question. My question is whether or not it was correctly stated in that news item that you were the committee's Washington representative.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I will decline to answer that question on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. SCHERER. If you were so proud, why don't you answer? Why don't you tell us whether or not you were the committee's Washington representative?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Well, Congressman—

Mr. SCHERER. If you are so proud of what you have done in this case, why don't you tell us all you did and where the money went, and whether it all went to the defense of the Rosenbergs, or how much of it went to the Communist Party? You can tell us all of that, instead of hiding behind the fifth amendment.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. You ought to be ashamed to make a statement of that kind.

Mr. SCHERER. No, I am not.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. You really should. You are implying that persons——

Chairman WALTER. Just a minute. I want to again refer to this document furnished by M. Harbus & Co., certified public accountants. You find on the fourth page of exhibit B, Washington office expense, \$3,967.63, which incidentally is three times the amount of the money given to the Rosenberg children.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I wish you expressed your concern for the children in 1953, Mr. Walter. They are orphans today.

Chairman WALTER. I ask you whether or not this \$3,900 was spent for the Washington office expenses.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. You see there is an implication in that question because of what Congressman Scherer said just preceding your question. It is precisely for that reason that a witness is put in a difficult position here. Congressman Scherer knows as well as I know——

Chairman WALTER. Just answer my question. How was that money expended?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I decline to answer that question.

Chairman WALTER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I have not completed my answer.

(Witness consults his counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. Let the record show that there is an extended consultation between the witness and counsel.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Is it a crime to consult a lawyer?

Mr. SCHERER. I didn't say that. I want the record to show what is going on. If I don't say what is going on, it won't show in the record.

Chairman WALTER. Let us save a lot of time. I will withdraw that question and we will proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

(Witness consults his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. In the June 22, 1953, issue of the Daily Worker, there is an article by Virginia Gardner entitled "Grim, Silent Vigil at the White House." Are you listening? In the course of the article appears this statement:

Don Rothenberg of the National Committee To Secure Justice estimated Friday night about 550 persons stayed overnight.

What position was it that you held at that time, in June 1953, with the national committee?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I think that is the same question restated. For your information I have a number of clippings. You seem to quote only from the Daily Worker.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer the question, please?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I have clippings from the New York Times, New York Herald Tribune, Washington Post and Star and Washington News, and newspapers throughout the world.

Chairman WALTER. Will you answer the question?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I have answered the same question before.

Chairman WALTER. Do you refuse to answer?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I decline to answer on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Chairman WALTER. Ask the next question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you in charge of any part of the demonstration in the District of Columbia between June 14 and 19, 1953, as a representative of the national organization?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Between June 14 and June 19, 1953? That was one of the finest, most peaceful demonstrations for justice that I have heard about.

Chairman WALTER. What was the date?

Mr. TAVENNER. June 14 to June 19, 1953. Will you answer the question, please?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. According to clippings I have here there were over 13,000 people that took part in that demonstration.

Mr. TAVENNER. You will not have to turn to your clippings to determine whether or not you were in charge of part of the demonstration. Will you answer the question, please?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. The question is was I in charge?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Of the demonstration?

Mr. TAVENNER. Of any part of the demonstration.

Mr. ROSENBERG. Of 13,000 people in front of the White House?

Mr. TAVENNER. I said of the demonstration.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I decline to answer that question on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Chairman WALTER. I notice there was some \$57,859 for delegations to Washington, railroad and so on, to this demonstration that you mention. Did you pay the expenses of the people to come to the demonstration?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. According to these clippings, Congressman, there were people who hitchhiked, people who came by train, people who lost time from work in order to come here. I honestly say that the implication you are leaving by that question is that some group, somewhere, pulled \$58,000 out of a hat and paid people to come to Washington.

Chairman WALTER. That is right. That is what we want to know about it. We want to know out of whose hat this \$58,000 was pulled. If you will answer the question, you will help us find the answer.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Congressman, all I can say is that to the best of my personal knowledge in my adult years I have never been connected with any group which misappropriated its funds, which misused its funds, or which diverted its funds, never.

Chairman WALTER. Now, then, having volunteered that, were you ever connected with any group that raised money for the Rosenberg defense?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Congressman, that is a restatement, I believe——

Chairman WALTER. That is not a statement. It is a question.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. It is another form of the same question which I declined to answer before on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Chairman WALTER. I had forgotten that. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have not yet answered my question as to whether or not you were in charge of any part of the demonstration that was conducted here between June 14 and June 19, 1953.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I think if you will check back with the secretary I did answer that question by declining to answer under my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I will accept that.

Did you make arrangements for the chartering of 15 buses to bring people into the city of Washington for that demonstration?

(No response.)

Chairman WALTER. Did you?

(Witness consults his counsel.)

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I guess you will read a whole number of these things into the record. I will just decline to answer that question on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Chairman WALTER. It wasn't so funny after all; was it?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I don't consider this funny, Congressman. I hope you don't think I did.

Chairman WALTER. Yes; I think you do. You have been sitting here laughing ever since this question was asked.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I am laughing because of the position that a witness is placed in here. I would be very glad if you would consent at your convenience that I would hitchhike or travel anywhere in the country to discuss this case with you, because there are other Members of Congress who have indicated concern about the case.

Chairman WALTER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Isn't it a fact that you incurred an expense of \$1,167.75 for the chartering of those buses?

(Witness consults his counsel.)

Mr. FORER. He personally?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. That I incurred such an expense?

Mr. TAVENNER. That that expense was incurred for the chartering of those buses.

(Witness consults his counsel.)

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I will just decline to answer that question on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was the bus company paid for its services in bringing in 15 buses?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I will decline to answer that question on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the source of the funds used to pay the bus company?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. What do you mean, what was the source of the funds?

Mr. TAVENNER. Just what the question says. What was the source of it. Where did the money come from?

(Witness consults his counsel.)

Mr. ROTHENBERG. The question was what was the source of the funds?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; used to pay the bus company.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. First of all, I have not discussed any payment to the bus company, to any bus company. Second, I am deeply concerned that you would ask questions about a peaceful assemblage of people. Why does it concern you so much?

Mr. TAVENNER. It certainly would not if the Communist Party were not involved in it. But if the Communist Party is involved in it, we are deeply concerned.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. In other words, if there was one Communist in any activity, it is bad; is that correct?

Mr. TAVENNER. Not at all. But if you, as a member of the Communist Party, were in charge of the demonstration, we want to know what the Communist Party was up to. Now, will you tell us?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. It was a peaceful demonstration; wasn't it?

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Wasn't it a peaceful demonstration?

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us?

Chairman WALTER. Answer the question, Mr. Witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us what the Communist Party was up to?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. You know that is a loaded question, Mr. Tavenner. I decline to answer the question on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment not to answer.

Mr. SCHERER. Here is one question that certainly is not loaded, Witness. Between 1951 and 1953, the National Committee to Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case collected \$302,530.17. What part of that, if any, went to the Communist Party?

(Witness consults his counsel.)

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I am sorry. I wonder if you would repeat it, because I want to get the exact language.

Mr. SCHERER. Read the question, please.

(Question read by the reporter.)

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I have no knowledge, Congressman Scherer, of any money collected for the Rosenberg-Sobell case going to the Communist Party or any other organization. I personally doubt, and this is my personal opinion—

Mr. SCHERER. Did you handle any of the funds?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I will decline to answer that question, Mr. Congressman, under my privilege under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you collect any funds?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I will answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you disburse any of the funds?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. That question has been asked of me before.

Mr. SCHERER. I am asking you again.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I will decline again to answer it on the basis of my rights under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. SCHERER. How much more, if any, was collected over and above the \$302,530.17 as shown in the report of the auditors?

(Witness consults his counsel.)

Mr. FORER. You mean collected by the committee?

Mr. SCHERER. By the committee.

(Witness consults his counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. Or anyone on behalf of the committee.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I have no knowledge whether there was any more or any less, but it is my personal conviction—my personal opinion—that every cent that was collected to save the lives of the Rosenbergs was spent for that purpose. It was spent for things like a transcript of the court record which is a completely unprecedented thing in any case of this kind.

Mr. SCHERER. What connection did you have, then, with that committee in order to be able to form the opinion you just gave us?

(Witness consults his counsel.)

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I will decline to answer that question. It is the same question which I declined to answer before. On the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. SCHERER. You just testified what was done with reference to having the court record printed or reprinted. How did you happen to know about that, if you were not on the committee?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Mr. Scherer, I told you earlier in my testimony that I became interested in this case on the basis of reading the court record. I think it is a wonderful thing that the committee——

Mr. SCHERER. That is not what you said. You indicated that the transcript of the court record was quite expensive.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I think you know as a lawyer the amount of money that it would cost to reproduce it. If you would like to take a look at it, I will be glad to show it to you [handing].

Mr. SCHERER. Who paid for the reproduction of this record? Who paid for this?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. You have a copy of the record there.

Mr. SCHERER. I am asking you the question. You handed it to me now, and I want to know who paid for it?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. It says there——

Mr. SCHERER. I am not asking you what it says there. I am asking you. I can read.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Well, Congressman, you know what it says. I know what it says. Let the record show that it says the National Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case.

Mr. SCHERER. I am asking you again, and I ask, Mr. Chairman, that you direct the witness to answer the question.

Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer the question.

Mr. FORER. You mean of his personal knowledge, is that the question?

Mr. SCHERER. I think he understands the question.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I will decline to answer that question on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment, and it is a part of a whole series of questions of that kind. I trust that you will get the opportunity to read that record, Congressman. It might be very interesting—I would be very interested in your opinions after you read it.

Mr. SCHERER. I have no further questions.

Chairman WALTER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us because you have not yet answered the question: What was the source of the funds used to pay the bus companies for the transportation of people to the city of Washington?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I have answered that question, Mr. Tavenner, and I think again if you will consult the record you will find that I have answered it.

Mr. TAVENNER. No, just indirectly. You have never answered the question directly.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Let me make it very clear that I decline to answer that question on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you presently officially connected with the National Committee for Justice to Morton Sobell?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I retained my interest in this case and will do so until Morton Sobell is out of Alcatraz and has been granted a new trial. I think that is going to happen, because there have been events recently which point to it, such as the trial——

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer the question, please?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. That is a question which I will decline to answer on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. SCHERER. Witness, I forgot to ask you one question when I was asking about the financing of this committee. How much money did the Communist Party contribute to the fund?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Congressman, I have no knowledge of any contributions by the Communist Party to the Rosenberg-Sobell case, and you are putting that kind of question in in order to leave certain implications. I think it is a disgrace.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you deny that there was such contribution?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I say to you that I have no knowledge.

Mr. SCHERER. As a member of the Communist Party and as one of the prime movers in this movement, you should know, shouldn't you?

(Witness consults his counsel.)

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Is that a question or is that a statement?

Mr. SCHERER. Yes, a question. Do you know?

(Witness consults his counsel.)

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I would simply decline to answer that question on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman, other than to ask the witness whether he is now a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Is that your last question?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. May I read my statement after that question?

Mr. TAVENNER. No. Answer the question.

Chairman WALTER. No, we are not interested in the statement.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I know you are not interested in my statement, Congressman. You have evidenced that from the moment I came on the stand.

Chairman WALTER. I am very allergic to anything that comes from the lips of any Communist. That includes you.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. Everything that comes from the lips of a Congressman I am interested in.

Chairman WALTER. Are you a member of the Communist Party?

(No response.)

Chairman WALTER. Are you?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. It was my understanding——

Chairman WALTER. Are you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I am going to give reasons.

Chairman WALTER. I am asking you a question. Are you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. May I give my reasons——

Chairman WALTER. No, you may not give any reasons at all. You can answer my question; are you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I want to consult with my attorney as to whether I have the right to give legal reasons for declining to answer a question.

Chairman WALTER. Go ahead and ask your attorney.

(Witness consults his counsel.)

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I decline to answer that question.

Chairman WALTER. All right.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. For the following reasons.

Chairman WALTER. Any further questions? That is all.

Mr. ROTHENBERG. I think it is important that I get my reasons—

Chairman WALTER. You are excused.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

Chairman WALTER. Call your next witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Mildred Rothenberg.

Chairman WALTER. Do you swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. ROTHENBERG. I do.

TESTIMONY OF MRS. MILDRED ROTHENBERG, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, JOSEPH FORER

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you Mrs. Mildred Rothenberg?

Mrs. ROTHENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted you are accompanied by the same counsel who accompanied the preceding witness.

Do you live in Cleveland?

Mrs. ROTHENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your name prior to marriage?

Mrs. ROTHENBERG. Crum.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you held any official position on the Cleveland Committee To Secure Clemency for the Rosenbergs?

Mrs. ROTHENBERG. Mr. Tavenner, I decline to answer that question on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself and also under the first amendment under my privilege of freedom of speech and to seek a redress of grievances.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, I have before me a photostatic copy of an advertisement which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on June 9, 1953, relating to the Rosenberg case.

At the bottom of it I see the following:

The advertisement was paid for by popular subscription and sponsored by the Cleveland Committee To Secure Clemency for the Rosenbergs, Post Office Box No. 21, Cleveland, Ohio, M. S. Rothenberg, executive secretary.

Mrs. ROTHENBERG. May I see the ad, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you examine the name of M. S. Rothenberg and state whether or not it refers to you [handing document to witness]?

Mrs. ROTHENBERG. I think it is a fine ad.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer the question after having made your speech.

Mrs. ROTHENBERG. I'm sorry. I didn't know it was a speech. I decline to answer under my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your middle initial?

Mrs. ROTHENBERG. My middle initial is "S."

Mr. TAVENNER. M. S., then, would be the proper initials to represent your name; is that correct?

Mrs. ROTHENBERG. Presumably.

Mr. TAVENNER. Presumably?

Mrs. ROTHENBERG. Presumably, if one's name were——

Mr. FORER. A very cute observation.

Mr. TAVENNER. Here is another article from the Plain Dealer which will be more specific as to the name. It bears date of June 14, 1953, "37 en route to appeal for spies, many left-wingers board bus to Washington."

In the course of the article I find this paragraph:

Mrs. Don Rothenberg, a spokesman for the group, said that the committee had no officers.

You are Mrs. Don Rothenberg, are you not?

Mrs. ROTHENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you correctly reported in stating that the committee had no officers?

(The witness consulted with her counsel.)

Mrs. ROTHENBERG. I decline to answer under my privilege as stated previously.

Mr. TAVENNER. You didn't go to Washington, did you, with the group?

(The witness consulted with her counsel.)

Mrs. ROTHENBERG. I decline to answer for the same reason. I believe the story does say that a Mrs. Don Rothenberg did not board the bus; it said she had to stay home with her children.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that correct?

Mrs. ROTHENBERG. I decline to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are not willing to state anything under oath about it?

Chairman WALTER. Of what crime do you think you might be convicted by admitting you stayed home with your children?

(The witness consulted with her counsel.)

Mr. FORER. There was a previous question she didn't answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let her answer the last question.

Mr. FORER. Which one?

Mr. TAVENNER. The chairman's.

Mr. FORER. What crime does she think she is guilty of by staying home with her children?

Mrs. ROTHENBERG. I don't think it is any crime. As a matter of fact, that is where I should be right now.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then will you answer the question?

Mrs. ROTHENBERG. Will you repeat the question, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. The question which was presented to you was this: Was it a fact that you did remain and so stated to the press at the time the bus left with the people for Washington?

Mrs. ROTHENBERG. I refuse to answer for the reasons stated previously.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether or not the first indication in Cleveland of the formation of a committee to secure justice for the Rosenbergs was announced at a meeting of the Progressive Party? Do you know?

(The witness consulted with her counsel.)

Mrs. ROTHENBERG. I have no such knowledge.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not the movement was first officially started through a joint meeting of the Cleveland Council of Arts, Sciences, and Professions, along with people representing the Ohio Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case?

Mrs. ROTHENBERG. I am sorry. I missed the first part of that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether or not the first meeting that was held in establishing and promoting the work of this group was a joint meeting of the Cleveland Council of Arts, Sciences, and Professions and the Ohio committee to secure justice for Julius and Ethel Rosenberg?

(The witness consulted her counsel.)

Mrs. ROTHENBERG. I have no such recollection.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were not an executive secretary of the organization upon its foundation, were you?

Mrs. ROTHENBERG. I decline to answer for the reasons stated previously.

Mr. TAVENNER. As a matter of fact, you succeeded another person quite some time later as executive secretary, didn't you?

(The witness consulted her counsel.)

Mrs. ROTHENBERG. I refuse, decline to answer for the reasons stated previously.

(The witness consulted her counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at any time during the year 1953?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. I decline to answer and invoke my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. ROTHENBERG. I am hesitating because I realize the dilemma this kind of questioning leads people into, but I am forced to invoke my privilege under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee what disposition was made by the Cleveland Committee to Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case, of the funds raised by it for the Rosenberg family?

Mrs. ROTHENBERG. I decline to answer for the reasons stated previously, but if you want a question of opinion, Mr. Counsel, my objective opinion would be that any funds—

Mr. TAVENNER. I am not interested in your opinion. If you have no facts on which you are willing to testify under oath, I am not interested in your opinion.

I have no further questions.

Chairman WALTER. Any questions?

Mr. SCHERER. No questions.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

Chairman WALTER. Call your next witness, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. John Gilman.

Chairman WALTER. Will you raise your right hand, please. Do you swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. GILMAN. I do.

**TESTIMONY OF JOHN GILMAN, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL,
MILTON H. FRIEDMAN**

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. GILMAN. John Gilman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel accompanying the witness please identify himself for the record?

Mr. FRIEDMAN. Milton H. Friedman, New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were you born, Mr. Gilman?

Mr. GILMAN. I think the committee has the record, but I will restate it. I was born on September 16, 1920, in a town called Chester, Pa.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. GILMAN. I think the committee has this record also, but I will restate it. Milwaukee, Wis.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in Milwaukee, Mr. Gilman?

Mr. GILMAN. I would say approximately 7 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your trade or occupation?

Mr. GILMAN. Does this figure in the investigation some, Mr. Counselor?

Mr. TAVENNER. Please answer the question.

Mr. GILMAN. I am an owner of a small business.

Mr. TAVENNER. What type of business?

Mr. GILMAN. A floor-covering and wall-covering business.

Mr. TAVENNER. In Milwaukee?

Mr. GILMAN. In Milwaukee, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, briefly, what your formal educational training has been?

Mr. GILMAN. At the age of 6 I started grammar school. At the termination of grammar school, I entered high school. At the termination of high school I entered college. At the termination of my bachelor of science degree I entered graduate school for 1 semester.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you complete your undergraduate work?

Mr. GILMAN. I believe I completed my undergraduate work in February—one moment, I won't have a camera snapping at me. If you want to take pictures, you are welcome to first, but not while I am testifying. I am sorry.

I believe I finished my undergraduate work in February of 1948.

Mr. TAVENNER. At what university?

Mr. GILMAN. At the University of Wisconsin.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was your graduate work taken the following year?

Mr. GILMAN. The graduate work was taken the very year when I finished my undergraduate work, the following semester, so to speak.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you move to Milwaukee immediately upon completion of your graduate work?

Mr. GILMAN. No, I was not finished with my graduate work. I had a brother in Milwaukee who asked me to assist him in opening up a floor-covering establishment. That brother is dead today. I still run that very same business.

In other words, I never got the opportunity to go back to complete my graduate work that I so desired.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the course of hearings conducted at Milwaukee this year, Mr. Merle Snyder identified you as a member of the

Communist Party and also Mr. James Eggleston, who had been employed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and worked in an undercover capacity in the Communist Party, identified you as a member of the Communist Party.

May I ask whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party in 1953?

Mr. GILMAN. I invoke the fifth amendment in refusing to answer this loaded question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have before me an article that was published in the press at Milwaukee entitled "Plea for Red Turned Down." It was a case in which District Attorney William McCauley rejected an appeal from the Wisconsin Civil Rights Congress to withdraw charges against a person who was a former member of the Communist Party.

Do you recall the incident?

Mr. GILMAN. May I see the article, Mr. Counselor?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir [handing document to witness].

(Witness consults with his counsel.)

Mr. GILMAN. This question and the answer to this question is an attempt to involve me in this particular instance with that of a man who was an avowed Communist and I refuse to be tricked into answering loaded questions for the benefit of attempting to silence me in any of my activity, and I am invoking the fifth amendment very strongly in this particular case because I don't feel that this committee or any particular authority has the right to restrict my beliefs under the first amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me call your attention to the last few paragraphs of this article in which the district attorney is quoted as having asked you—

(The witness consulted his attorney.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you hear?

Mr. GILMAN. Yes, I heard. I am sorry.

Mr. TAVENNER. Whether or not you are a Communist, to which you replied, "No, I am not, but I am very interested in civil rights."

Did you make the reply attributed to you?

Mr. GILMAN. I have been fighting for civil rights ever since I learned to understand—

Chairman WALTER. That isn't an answer to the question.

Mr. GILMAN. Will you restate the question, Mr. Counselor?

Mr. TAVENNER. The article states that the district attorney asked you the question: "Are you a Communist?" and your reply is in quotations, "No, I am not, but I am very interested in civil rights."

Did you make the reply attributed to you?

Mr. GILMAN. My answer to that question is substantially the same answer that I previously gave when I invoked the fifth amendment, two answers back.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you were correctly quoted, was it the truth, or not the truth?

Mr. GILMAN. This committee is attempting—and it is extremely obvious with other people throughout the country—to trick people into contempt citations, perjury citations, with the use of paid stool pigeons, and I invoke the fifth amendment for the previous reason I stated two questions back.

Chairman WALTER. Let's see that we understand each other. What do you mean by "stool pigeon"?

Mr. GILMAN. A stool pigeon, Mr. Chairman, I think you should know this——

Chairman WALTER. I have my own ideas.

Mr. GILMAN. I have great respect for elderly people, and that is why I said I think you should know this. I think you have much more knowledge and understanding of what a stool pigeon is, long before I was born.

Chairman WALTER. Probably.

Mr. GILMAN. A stool pigeon is a commonly used word meaning a person for reasons of monetary gain, prestige, or what have you, will sell his whole soul away, either through lying, deception, half-truth, or whatever way he can.

Chairman WALTER. What you mean is this: He is a person who tells on somebody else who has been engaged in a criminal act, either with him or alone; is that what you mean?

Mr. GILMAN. I wouldn't interpret that as a stool pigeon.

Mr. SCHERER. The person who——

Mr. GILMAN. I would like to finish the answer to my definition of a stool pigeon, Mr. Scherer, and with due respect to your position, I am just a citizen and I am sure you will allow me to finish.

When I was small, I used to go to movies like cowboys and Indians—you know what the American heritage of cowboys and Indians is, I am sure—and in those very same movies there were people who used to make up stories, and they got to be known as stool pigeons, and as I grew older, stool pigeons meant anyone in my mind who, by his own personal gain or through pressure or coercion or some reason, is forced or voluntarily testifies and usually I found stool pigeons to have criminal records.

Chairman WALTER. We are not concerned with that.

Mr. GILMAN. I thought you wanted a definition of stool pigeon. I am sure you understand.

Chairman WALTER. Go ahead, Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you classify Mr. Eggleston and Mr. Snyder who, before this committee under oath, identified you as a member of the Communist Party, to be stool pigeons?

(The witness consulted with his counsel.)

Mr. GILMAN. I most definitely would classify those two individuals in that definition that I just gave, but obviously not being a child, Mr. Scherer, I can see you are attempting to trap me to a perjury citation by lining them up against me in some way or other, and for that reason I am invoking the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. I merely asked you whether you consider these two men as stool pigeons, and you said you would put them in that classification. I am going to ask you whether those two men when they identified you as a member of the Communist Party were telling the truth or whether they were lying, irrespective of the fact of whether or not they were stool pigeons. We want to know whether they were lying.

Mr. GILMAN. I just finished telling you that I am before this committee, Mr. Chairman—I was just before this committee 3 or 4 months ago.

Chairman WALTER. I didn't have the pleasure of——

Mr. GILMAN. I was heard before the Honorable Representative Doyle. I am sure I showed due respect to our institutions at that

hearing, I am sure Mr. Scherer will agree, but I am before this committee today because this committee feels for some unknown reason to me that I should be placed in contempt—

Chairman WALTER. We are not interested in putting you in contempt. You say we want you for some unknown reason. We are interested in trying to get you to cooperate with us by telling us what we think you know. That is all.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Walter, if that were the case, with all due respect to your position in Congress, even though I heartily disagree with your legislation, if that were the case, you would permit me to tell you when I said—and I was cut off—that I have been fighting for civil rights ever since I began to understand the written word well enough to interpret.

Chairman WALTER. A moment ago you said you don't agree with my legislation. What legislation?

Mr. GILMAN. Specifically, the Walter-McCarran Act.

Chairman WALTER. The Walter-McCarran Immigration Act?

Mr. GILMAN. I am sorry.

Chairman WALTER. I am not surprised at that.

Mr. GILMAN. I know you are not.

Chairman WALTER. The real fight against that law comes from your ilk, who don't like the provisions that make it—

Mr. GILMAN. I happen to be Jewish, and the B'nai B'rith, if you wish to classify them as ilk, have denounced your legislation.

Chairman WALTER. I am not going to stand for that. You and others like you are casting a reflection on great people, and you are doing something that is very harmful to America.

Mr. GILMAN. People who classify ethnically—

Chairman WALTER. I don't want anything religious in this hearing.

Mr. GILMAN. I did not mention religion.

Chairman WALTER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Gilman, the article I showed you referred to your representation of this individual, a former Communist Party organizer, and refers to you as the executive secretary of the Wisconsin Civil Rights Congress. Were you the executive secretary?

Mr. GILMAN. We went over this before, but since you asked the question again, I would like to address the question to Mr. Walter, too, since he wasn't present at that meeting.

Chairman WALTER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. He hasn't answered the question. Will you answer the question?

Mr. GILMAN. I am invoking for the same reason I have stated in four previous questions the fifth amendment, article V, of the Bill of Rights, and it is obvious that this question was asked in order to attempt to trick me into some citation of contempt or perjury. I am very familiar from what this committee has performed throughout the country.

Mr. SCHERER. Witness, you called two fine people who testified under oath before this committee stool pigeons.

Mr. GILMAN. I didn't say that. I placed them in that category. Quote me correctly.

Mr. SCHERER. You have an opportunity here to say publicly under oath whether those people you put in that class were telling the truth about you, and you refuse to tell us.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Scherer, I decline to answer.

Mr. Counselor, may I have some water, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; indeed. To what extent was the Civil Rights Congress in Milwaukee or its leadership active in the promotion of the work of the Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case?

Mr. GILMAN. I have no knowledge of that.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have no knowledge?

Mr. GILMAN. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Weren't you the chairman of the Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case in Milwaukee?

Mr. GILMAN. I decline to answer that—article V.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a copy of a throwaway sheet bearing date of March 13, 1953, and ask you to examine it, please, and state whether or not your signature appears at the bottom of the paper. The other side, please.

Mr. GILMAN. You mean where it says about Pope Pius pleading—

Mr. TAVENNER. You heard what I said. I asked you about the signature at the bottom of the page and asked whether it was yours.

Mr. GILMAN. You asked me if this particular signature stenciled at the bottom is mine?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. GILMAN. I invoke the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. What name appears underneath the signature? (The witness consulted with his counsel.)

Mr. GILMAN. Tom Clark. You mean what name—directly under the signature?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. GILMAN. It says "Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case."

Mr. TAVENNER. What position did you hold with the Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case at that time, March 1953?

Mr. GILMAN. I invoke the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the document in evidence and I ask that it be marked "Gilman Exhibit No. 1."

(The exhibit referred to follows:)

GILMAN EXHIBIT No. 1

MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN,
P. O. Box 1919, March 13, 1953.

DEAR FRIEND: Like thousands of other Jews, Protestants, and Catholics in our own country and millions throughout the world, you have probably been deeply disturbed at the unprecedented death sentence of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg.

Thousands of Protestant clergymen and publications in dozens of countries have appealed for a reduction of the sentence. Catholic clergymen and publications have done likewise; notably Pope Pius XII as noted in the official Catholic newspaper, *L'Observatore Romano*.

Eminent lawyers here and abroad have protested the sentence; many like Chief Justice James Wolfe, of the Supreme Court of Utah, have strongly questioned the testimony and evidence on which conviction was based. Famous scientists, among them Dr. Harold C. Urey and Dr. Albert Einstein, felt that the testimony was not fully convincing, and that the sentence was unjustified. As

Dorothy Thompson said upon first learning of the sentence: "The death sentence depresses me. In 1944, we were not at war with the Soviet Union." And Arthur Garfield Hays remarked: "It is the damnable death penalty that causes the uneasiness."

Some Jewish people have been held back from action which lay open to them, by a fear of being considered special pleaders for fellow Jews. We cannot, in justice to ourselves, refuse to stand up for a principle just because the persons involved in the case happen to be Jews. That would be a queer sort of inverted Anti-Semitism and the result would be the same as with the usual kind of Anti-Semitism.

As the Jewish Day declared (Oct. 16, 1952): "Believing in our democratic system of justice and in the just application of our laws, we feel that we are entitled to appeal to the President that he should commute the death sentence."

If you have previously written to the President, please write again to President Eisenhower, to ask him to reconsider his refusal to extend clemency. In any case, it is most important to write a letter before March 31st, to one or all of the Justices of the Supreme Court to urge them respectfully to review this case.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN GILMAN,

Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case.

Supreme Court Justices:

Fred M. Vinson, Chief Justice

Hugo Black

Sherman Minton

Tom Clark

William O. Douglas

Felix Frankfurter

Chairman WALTER. Mark it and let it be received.

I notice that this is addressed to "Dear Friend" and signed "Yours sincerely, John Gilman, Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case."

Mr. GILMAN. What does the rest of it say?

Mr. TAVENNER. I am only stating this for the purpose of identification. Are you the John Gilman whose signature appears on the bottom of this letter?

Mr. GILMAN. I am the John Gilman who received the Distinguished Service Cross for valor fighting for our country.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am asking if you are the same person as the John Gilman whose name appears on this letter?

Mr. GILMAN. I answered that question. You asked me twice. You don't have to go over it so many times. Ask me the question once and I will answer it once, sir, with all due respect.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you compose the body of the letter based upon information furnished by the national organization of the committee—

Mr. GILMAN. I am invoking the—

Mr. TAVENNER. Wait a minute. [Continuing:] Of the Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case?

Mr. GILMAN. I just invoked the fifth amendment to that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, I ask you to look at the reverse side of the same document and state—

Mr. GILMAN. Before I make any identification—

Mr. TAVENNER. Wait until you get the question.

Mr. GILMAN. I am sorry.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you examine the reverse side of the same document and state what organization it was that disseminated it?

Mr. GILMAN. Well, I will tell you. This doesn't mean a thing. It is a mimeographed document and the McCarthy committee was excellent in cutting pictures—

Chairman WALTER. Did you see that document before?

Mr. GILMAN. I never saw this side of this document before, but that is my point.

Chairman WALTER. Did you ever see one like it?

Mr. GILMAN. I have never seen one like it.

Chairman WALTER. At the bottom of the letter appears your name. Is that your name?

Mr. GILMAN. I refuse to answer that question. There is no name down here.

Chairman WALTER. Turn it over, who is the sponsor?

Mr. GILMAN. Wisconsin Civil Rights Congress.

Mr. TAVENNER. The reverse side of the document advertises a meeting under the auspices of the Wisconsin Civil Rights Congress, does it not?

Mr. GILMAN. I just stated the McCarthy-Army hearings produced forgeries of all sorts.

Chairman WALTER. Is this a forgery?

Mr. GILMAN. I don't know. I don't know anything about that document on the other side. This is the first time I have seen it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you chairman of the Civil Rights Congress on March 13, 1953, when that document was prepared?

Mr. GILMAN. I invoke the fifth amendment to any questions about my capacity.

(The witness consulted with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, actually, the Rosenberg committee and the Civil Rights Congress were acting jointly in putting out this document: is that correct?

Mr. GILMAN. From this document, which I haven't seen before on this side, but I would like this other side read into the record, with your permission, since you introduced it.

Chairman WALTER. You needn't bother reading it.

Mr. GILMAN. Why not? Don't you want to be fair about it? Why try to trap a person?

Chairman WALTER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. GILMAN. I will read it.

Chairman WALTER. No, you are not going to read it. That is a vicious attempt to do something that I think is——

Mr. GILMAN. I misunderstood you. I thought you said, "Go ahead and read it."

Chairman WALTER. Go ahead, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me hand you another document entitled, "This is the ad the Milwaukee Journal refused to print," and look at the last line and state what committee it was that published that document and who was the chairman of it.

Mr. GILMAN. Well, I will tell you, it is a little torn.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, a little of it is torn off, but I think you can make it out.

(The witness consulted with his counsel.)

Mr. FRIEDMAN. What is the question?

Mr. TAVENNER. My question is: State what organization it was which sponsored the distribution of that document and the name of the chairman.

Mr. GILMAN. I am invoking the fifth amendment on this.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you read the name of the organization as it appears at the bottom?

Mr. GILMAN. Well, it says "Provisional Committee to Commute the"—and it looks like "Death," and then underneath it is torn off on the right and it says "bergs, J. Gilman, P. O. Box 1919, Milwaukee." That is as far as it goes. The rest is torn off.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you chairman of the Provisional Committee To Commute the Death Sentence of the Rosenbergs?

Mr. GILMAN. I invoke the fifth amendment on that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted that the post office box is 1919.

(The witness consulted with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know to whom that post office box was issued?

Mr. GILMAN. I am invoking the fifth amendment, but I want to say that I am not ashamed of anything that I have done to save the lives of the Rosenbergs. I believe the Rosenbergs were framed by such individuals in Government who had disregard for human life.

You are certainly connecting the Rosenberg case explicitly as though they were guilty, and I will fight as I fought against the Nazi overseas for their innocence. I made a mistake in Milwaukee, and Mr. Doyle wouldn't let me speak there, but I was willing to sacrifice my life, and I am still willing to give my life for the American people, and I am doing it because I believe in our heritage of our country, in the Thomas Jeffersons and the Paines and the people who had to sweat and fight the Alien and Sedition Acts. That is what I am doing today, and I am very proud, and you brought a question up about this war.

Chairman WALTER. Never mind.

Mr. GILMAN. I can answer it right now.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you examine this application for post-office box and state whether or not opposite the typewritten statement "signature of applicant" your name, John Gilman, appears?

Mr. GILMAN. As I said before, we went through this in Milwaukee.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were not asked about that.

(The witness consulted his counsel.)

Mr. GILMAN. On this particular affidavit I am invoking the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the document in evidence and ask that it be marked "Gilman Exhibit No. 2."

(The exhibit referred to follows:)

GILMAN EXHIBIT No. 2

Form 1003
(Rev. 4-15)

APPLICATION FOR POST-OFFICE BOX

12/30/52
(Date)

The undersigned hereby applies for the use of a box in the post office at Milwaukee, Wis. and agrees to comply with the postal regulations and rules relative to the renting and use of post-office boxes.

If the box is rented for a corporation, the applicant should write on the lines below the name of the corporation; if for a firm, the name of the firm and the full name of each of its members whose mail is to be placed in the box.

PROVISIONAL COMMITTEE TO COMMUTE THE DEATH SENTENCE FOR THE ROSENBERGS

Signature of applicant John Gilman

Character of business _____

Business address _____

Residence address 2409 W. Hartford Street, Milwaukee, Wis.

Reference: Chas. F. Kerkel, 3119 South 4th St., Milwaukee, Wis.

Assigned Box No. 1919 P.M. Adm. 3

Jan 1st 1953

VERIFICATION OF REFERENCE OF APPLICANT FOR BOX

UNITED STATES POST OFFICE

Milwaukee, Wisconsin Dec 30, 1952

Charles F. Kerkel

An application for a post office box has been made by the undersigned, who was called in reference to:

Name of applicant John Gilman

Character of business _____

Business address _____

Residence address 2409 W. Hartford Street

Will you kindly advise this office if, in your judgment, the applicant is trustworthy and reliable?

REPLY:

Charles F. Kerkel

Form 1002

Chairman WALTER. Mark it and let it be received.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is an application for the issuance of post office box 1919, mentioned in the document presented to the witness, to receive the mail of the Provisional Committee To Commute the Death Sentence for the Rosenbergs.

Will you tell the committee, please, what part other members of the Communist Party in Milwaukee played in the organization and operation of the committee in Milwaukee—that is, the Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case.

Mr. GILMAN. The framing of the Rosenbergs was McCarthyism at its height. To go into detail—

Chairman WALTER. That is not an answer. I have heard better Communists than you. You are not impressing us.

Mr. GILMAN. That is your personal opinion.

Chairman WALTER. That is right. We are not trying the Rosenbergs.

Mr. GILMAN. It is a habit of calling people Communists—

Chairman WALTER. Are you one?

Mr. GILMAN. I will not answer such a question to this committee that asks loaded questions. I invoke the fifth amendment because the Constitution was put there for such type of questions.

Chairman WALTER. Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a document purporting to be issued by the Milwaukee committee in the Rosenberg-Sobell case, John Gilman, chairman, and ask you to examine the statement near the bottom of the second page. Do you see there the statement: Issued by the Milwaukee Committee in the Rosenberg-Sobell Case, John Gilman, chairman; do you see that language there?

Mr. GILMAN. What are you trying to prove? I certainly do see it. I told you time and again that I will invoke the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. You see that language there. Now, my question is: Are you today the chairman of the Milwaukee committee in the Rosenberg-Sobell case?

Mr. GILMAN. I invoke the fifth amendment to that question. I invoked it before because I feel that this committee is attempting to trick me, and that is why I was asked so many times into being a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you sent as a delegate or representative from the local organization of the Civil Rights Congress or the local organization of the Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case to Washington in January 1953, or in June 1953, to take part in demonstrations here?

Mr. GILMAN. I am invoking the fifth amendment in answer to that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WALTER. No questions. The witness is excused.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a personal request?

Chairman WALTER. The committee stands adjourned to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. GILMAN. May I have a personal request that has nothing to do with the hearings? May I have the witness fee due me so that I can get back to Milwaukee?

Mr. TAVENNER. At the close of our Milwaukee hearings, as you came forward to collect your witness fee, you stated for the record and for the audience that you were donating your fee or compensation as a witness to the Civil Rights Congress. Did you do it?

MR. GILMAN. I would like to tell you this.

MR. TAVENNER. Did you do it?

MR. GILMAN. I would like to correct his statement. It is not exactly accurate.

Chairman WALTER. That is the way our reporter got it.

MR. GILMAN. That is not accurate. I have witnesses that I was dismissed, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WALTER. Newspaper people had it.

MR. GILMAN. I had witnesses from newspaper people; I have checked on it, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WALTER. All right. That is not important, Mr. Tavenner.

MR. GILMAN. I was dismissed from the hearings, but the reporter deliberately attempted to make it look like I was under oath.

MR. TAVENNER. The only distinction you make is that you were not under oath when you said it? That is probably correct.

Chairman WALTER. Did you say it after you were excused from testifying?

MR. GILMAN. Yes. In fact, George L.—

Chairman WALTER. Did you actually contribute it?

MR. GILMAN. Yes, I made the contribution to the Civil Rights Congress of \$6, just as I said I would.

Chairman WALTER. The committee will stand adjourned.

(Whereupon, the committee adjourned, to reconvene at 10 a. m., Wednesday, August 3, 1955.)

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES (THE COMMITTEE TO SECURE JUSTICE IN THE ROSENBERG CASE AND AFFILIATES)—PART I

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 3, 1955

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

PUBLIC HEARING

A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met at 10:30 a. m., pursuant to recess, in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building, Hon. Francis E. Walter (chairman) presiding.

Present: Representatives Walter (presiding), Doyle.

Present also: Frank S. Tavenner, counsel; George C. Williams, investigator.

Chairman WALTER. The committee will be in order.

Under the authority vested in the chairman, I appoint a subcommittee consisting of Representatives Clyde Doyle, Edwin E. Willis, and myself. The quorum of the subcommittee being present, we will proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to call Mr. Herman E. Thomas. Will you come forward, please, Mr. Thomas.

Chairman WALTER. Raise your right hand, please. Do you swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. THOMAS. I do.

TESTIMONY OF HERMAN E. THOMAS

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your full name, Mr. Thomas?

Mr. THOMAS. Herman E. Thomas.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are familiar with the rule of this committee, that each witness has the right to have counsel accompany him, and that he has a right if he so desires to consult counsel at any time during the course of his interrogation?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Thomas.

Mr. THOMAS. I was born September 16, 1911, in Philadelphia, Pa.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. THOMAS. I now reside in Allentown, Pa.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been?

Mr. THOMAS. I graduated from Bethlehem High School and Bethlehem Business College, in Bethlehem.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Thomas, have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, sir, I have.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. THOMAS. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state the period over which you were a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. THOMAS. I was a member of the Communist Party from 1937 until 1939, the latter part of 1939, and then again from April 1944 until May 6, 1954.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the latter period of your membership, I believe you reentered the Communist Party at the request of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; did you not?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that your membership during that period was organizational membership only at the request of an investigative branch of the Federal Government.

Mr. THOMAS. In January of 1944, I was approached by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and asked to try to get back into the party, and I was successful in April of 1944, getting back into the Communist Party, and I worked for the Bureau for 10 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the occasion for the termination of your relationship with the Federal Bureau of Investigation as a person operating within the Communist Party?

Mr. THOMAS. On May 6, 1954, I testified for the Government against 9 Communist leaders of eastern Pennsylvania and Delaware who were indicted for advocating the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of course, as a result of that testimony your activity was disclosed to the Communist Party?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what branch of the Communist Party it was to which you were assigned in 1944, when you entered it on behalf of the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. THOMAS. In 1944, as I said, in April, I was assigned to the Bethlehem Club of the Communist Party, which was in Bethlehem. Then around the latter part of 1945 there was organized a Steel Club of the Communist Party, and I became a member of that club, being the membership director of that club. I remained in that club until the time I moved to Allentown, which was in 1947, and then I belonged to the Allentown Club of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what responsibility was given you by the Communist Party after 1944?

Mr. THOMAS. Well, I held the job of treasurer of the section for a time. I was also a member of the section committee. Then in 1950, in August, I think, the section committee was disbanded and there was formed a three-man secretariat to take charge of the Communist Party activities in the Lehigh Valley section. I became a member of that committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. You said you were on the section committee of the Communist Party. During what period of time was that?

Mr. THOMAS. Well, that was a short time after I got into the party, in 1944, and then up until 1950 when the section committee was disbanded. Then for a time, I think it was around 1952, and part of 1953, they reestablished the section committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, the area over which the section committee had jurisdiction?

Mr. THOMAS. Well, the Lehigh Valley area of the Communist Party took in Allentown, Bethlehem, Easton, and including Bucks County.

Mr. TAVENNER. That would include what counties?

Mr. THOMAS. Lehigh, Northampton, and Bucks.

Mr. TAVENNER. Normally how many persons composed the section committee of the Communist Party in that area?

Mr. THOMAS. It varied from time to time. At one time there were as many as 11 on the section committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee the functions of the section committee of the Communist Party?

Mr. THOMAS. Well, the section organizer of the Communist Party usually called the meetings of the section committee, and at those meetings we would discuss the plans of work to be carried out by the different clubs of the area—what the meetings would consist of in the clubs and probably during educational periods, what books would be discussed and studied.

Mr. TAVENNER. The section committee, in other words, had the responsibility of the direction of the work of all of the Communist Party clubs within the area?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct. They were the liaison so to speak of the district, between the district and the section.

Mr. TAVENNER. How were the section committeemen chosen?

Mr. THOMAS. Well, they were elected at a section convention, as a rule. From time to time they would hold section conventions, and a nominating committee would be appointed, and a list of names submitted to the convention, and then they would hold an election and would elect the members of the section committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then it would be correct to say that the members of the section committee were the leaders in the Communist Party in the particular areas represented by them?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated that you testified for the Government in May 1954?

Mr. THOMAS. May 6, 1954.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the Smith Act case in Philadelphia. Along about that time, did you receive a subpoena from this committee?

Mr. THOMAS. I think the second week that I was testifying I received a subpoena from the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. TAVENNER. What did you do when you received the subpoena from this committee?

Mr. THOMAS. Well, I told the man who served the subpoena that I was under subpoena to the Justice Department and I was a witness in the Smith Act case in Philadelphia. He told me that the subpoena

would be held in abeyance until such a time that I could appear before the committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did this committee do that?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. At your request, and also at the request of the Attorney General?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Because of your being a witness in that case?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have not testified before this committee since that time, have you?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct; this is the first time.

Mr. TAVENNER. But in the meantime, have you testified before another congressional committee?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, I have appeared before a few congressional committees.

Mr. TAVENNER. Returning now to the question of your work on the section committee of the Communist Party, in the Lehigh Valley. Will you tell the committee, please, the names of the persons you can now recall who served on the section committee of the Communist Party in the Lehigh Valley with you?

Mr. THOMAS. Well, from time to time there was Irving Riskin; Mother Ella Reeve Bloor, who is now dead; a section organizer by the name of William Hood; a section organizer we had by the name of William Powers, known in the party as just "Jack." There was Ted Norton; and Billie Jane Lipsett.

Mr. TAVENNER. Not quite so fast, please.

Mr. THOMAS. Billie Jane Lipsett. There was a fellow by the name of Joseph Picucci; and a William Charles Erney. That is about all I can recall at this time.

Mr. TAVENNER. The first name that you mentioned was Irving Riskin. Will you tell the committee what you can about his activity generally within the Communist Party?

Mr. THOMAS. I think Irving Riskin came into our area around 1947. He had been chairman at the length of time I was in the party, he was chairman of the Allentown City Club. He served on the section committee and also served on the section secretariat, and there was a time when we were without a section organizer, and he acted as the organizational secretary of the Communist Party of Lehigh Valley.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he organizational secretary?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you mention the name of Ted Norton as one of the persons who served on the executive committee?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where was Mr. Norton from?

Mr. THOMAS. Easton, Pa.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was his activity within the Communist Party?

Mr. THOMAS. I just recall a few meetings of the section committee that Ted Norton attended. He was quite active in the political end of the party, and also in fund raising.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over what period of time would you place him on the executive committee of the Communist Party, or the section committee?

Mr. THOMAS. Well, it was some time during the period 1945 until 1954.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mentioned the name of Billie Jane Lipsett. In a general way what was her participation in the work of the Communist Party?

Mr. THOMAS. She had been the treasurer of the Easton Professional Club and served on the section committee. Her responsibilities were also of a political nature in the party. She was responsible for a time for the Progressive Party in our area.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was she from Easton?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe you said that there was a time in 1950, about 1950 when the section committee was disbanded, and a different setup used.

Mr. THOMAS. In August 1950, there was a meeting, the section organizer, William Hood at that time, called a meeting of the section committee and stated that the directives from the district in Philadelphia were that we disband the section committee because it had too many members on it, and for security reasons it should be broken down, and also that the club meetings would be broken down into groups of 3 and 4. At that time there was a section secretariat appointed to take over the activity of the Lehigh Valley Section. I was one of those members appointed on that section secretariat.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many composed the section secretariat?

Mr. THOMAS. There were two others, besides myself, and we would meet once or twice a month with the section organizer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were the other members of the section secretariat?

Mr. THOMAS. Joseph Picucci, who resided in Bethlehem, and Maurice Chasan, who resided in Bucks County.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there a time when Bucks County was removed from the jurisdiction of your section organization?

Mr. THOMAS. After William Hood was removed as a section organizer from the Lehigh Valley Section, the new section organizer requested that Bucks County be put into the Philadelphia district inasmuch as it had become important with the establishment of the Fairless plant of United States Steel. That was that they should be attached to Philadelphia and that was done.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the wife of Irving Riskin?

Mr. THOMAS. Adelaide Riskin.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Adelaide Riskin known to you as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, sir, she was.

Mr. TAVENNER. On what do you base your statement?

Mr. THOMAS. She was a member of the same club that I belonged to in the Communist Party. She attended closed meetings of that club.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with a person by the name of Harriet Karol?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, sir, I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was she known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. THOMAS. As of May 6, 1954, she was a member of the Allentown City Club of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. On what do you base your statement?

Mr. THOMAS. That I attended party meetings or club meetings both at Riskin's home and at Harriet Karol's home.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was this individual known as Billie Jane Lipsett from Easton, Pa., the same person in whose home a Communist Party meeting was held for the purpose of laying plans for the defeat of Representative Francis E. Walter, as you testified in another hearing?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, sir, it was, the same place.

Mr. TAVENNER. And the same individual?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. I do not want to go into detail in repeating other testimony that you have given, but will you tell us in a general way about that meeting which was held in her home? That is, the persons who attended it?

Mr. THOMAS. Hank Beitscher, who was—Henry Beitscher was the Progressive Party candidate for Governor of Pennsylvania in the last election. He was at that meeting, along with Billie Jane Lipsett, Ted Norton, Dave Karol, Irving Riskin, and myself, and there were a few others there.

(At this point, Mr. Willis entered the hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. As a member of the secretariat, section secretariat, of the Communist Party, and living in Allentown, were you in charge of the work of the Communist Party in Allentown?

Mr. THOMAS. I was more or less responsible for the activities in Allentown, for a time.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were responsible for its direction?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I ask you how long you remained in that position while living in Allentown?

Mr. THOMAS. I was a member of the secretariat until I testified in Philadelphia, May 6, 1954.

Mr. TAVENNER. During that period of time, was there anything that came to your attention regarding propaganda work in behalf of the Rosenbergs?

Mr. THOMAS. Quite a bit of activity took place within the party on behalf of the Rosenbergs.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was an organized group formed in Allentown to be known or designated as a Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case, or clemency for the Rosenbergs?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, sir. In the latter part of 1952, there was a meeting held at the home of Sylvia Freedland, in Allentown, at which time they had a speaker come from New York. I think his name was Yuri Suhl, and he was a writer. At that meeting, a committee was formed to secure justice for the Rosenbergs, inasmuch as it would disseminate literature, raise money, and send telegrams and be responsible for that sort of work.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to the holding of that meeting, was literature or propaganda information relating to the Rosenbergs being disseminated in that area of Allentown?

Mr. THOMAS. Well, in the whole Lehigh Valley we would get material from district party headquarters in Philadelphia, and they

would distribute it in the Communist Party clubs, and on several occasions, requests were made to send telegrams, that is, party members send telegrams or letters of protest asking for clemency for the Rosenbergs.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, that activity was engaged in before the committee was actually set up, is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. In Allentown?

Mr. THOMAS. In the whole of Lehigh Valley.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did this material come from?

Mr. THOMAS. Well, on several occasions it was brought up from Philadelphia by Michael Freedland.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Freedland brought it from Philadelphia?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct. And on several occasions when a functionary of the party would come up from Philadelphia to attend a section meeting, they would bring up literature.

Mr. TAVENNER. So other functionaries brought the material from Philadelphia?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was this material put out by the national organization known as the National Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case?

Mr. THOMAS. I think some of it was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was this material brought to your Communist Party meetings?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. And the Communist Party in Allentown undertook the responsibility of dissemination of that material?

Mr. THOMAS. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. And also asking that messages be sent the President in behalf of the Rosenbergs?

Mr. THOMAS. To the Attorney General, that is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was any discussion held, to your knowledge, at these Communist Party meetings regarding the need of an organization to be set up for the purpose or with the responsibility of carrying on this work?

Mr. THOMAS. I cannot recall if there was actually any discussion in the party of the need for setting up a committee, although at many of the meetings we were told to work within the mass organization that we had contact with to bring the Rosenberg question up and to try to get support for clemency for the Rosenbergs, both in unions and churches and so forth.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say finally a meeting was held in August of 1952, at which such an organization was established?

Mr. THOMAS. It wasn't in August, it was in the latter part, I would say around October or November of 1952 when this meeting was held.

Mr. TAVENNER. Approximately how many persons were present at that organizational meeting?

Mr. THOMAS. There might have been about 12 or 14 people present. I know some of them, and I don't recall all of them that were there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were any persons present who were not known to you to be members of the Communist Party, and if so, approximately how many?

Mr. THOMAS. I think there were 3 or 4 that I didn't know to be members of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you at this time give the committee the names of Communist Party members who were there?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes. Ted Norton was there; Billie Jane Lipsett; Irving Riskin; Adelaide Riskin; and Maude and Scott Nichol. That is all that I can recall at the present time, who were Communists there.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many of those individuals were persons who were recognized leaders in the Communist Party by having been elected to the section committee of the Communist Party?

Mr. THOMAS. Ted Norton; Billie Jane Lipsett; and Irving Riskin.

Mr. TAVENNER. Three of them?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. And yourself as a fourth?

Mr. THOMAS. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was this meeting in the home of a Mrs. Freedland?

Mr. THOMAS. Sylvia Freedland; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Mrs. Sylvia Freedland known to you as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. THOMAS. I have never seen a card which indicated that Mrs. Freedland was a member of the Communist Party, but I do know that she attended several meetings of the Bethlehem City Club in Bethlehem which were closed Communist Party meetings, and had contributed to Communist Party causes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you know she contributed to Communist Party causes?

Mr. THOMAS. Well on one occasion I received money from her myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mentioned the fact that a Mr. Freedland brought some of the Rosenberg material from Philadelphia to Allentown. My recollection was it was to the Communist Party.

Mr. THOMAS. He would bring it to his home and I would pick it up from his home, or on several occasions he delivered it to me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Mr. Freedland known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. THOMAS. He told me at one time he belonged to the Communist Party and it was only that he told me. I have no proof that he was a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what business is Mr. Freedland engaged?

Mr. THOMAS. I think Mr. Freedland manages the Radio, Television, and Technical School in Allentown.

Chairman WALTER. Now?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Chairman WALTER. Is he a big heavy-set man?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, he is heavy-set.

Chairman WALTER. And tall?

Mr. THOMAS. Not too tall, I imagine about my size.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether any directions were received by Communist Party members in Allentown from a higher level in the Communist Party regarding work to be done in connection with the Rosenberg case?

Mr. THOMAS. Well, I remember on one occasion when Joseph Roberts came up to Allentown to meet with Sylvia Freedland and Harriet Karol, and Adelaide Riskin to discuss with them the carrying

on of the work within an organization in Allentown in regard to the Rosenbergs, and also the Walter-McCarran bill.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was this individual?

Mr. THOMAS. Joseph Roberts.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who is Joseph Roberts?

Mr. THOMAS. Joseph Roberts was 1 of those 9 indicted leaders in Philadelphia, and he was the district organizer for the Communist Party of eastern Pennsylvania and Delaware.

Mr. TAVENNER. And you say he gave directions relating to work to be done in connection with the Walter-McCarran Act?

Mr. THOMAS. And the defense of the Rosenbergs.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the character of the directions that he gave?

Mr. THOMAS. Well, three individuals from the Communist Party, namely Adelaide Riskin, Sylvia Freedland, and Harriet Karol were members of the American Jewish Congress which had a branch in Allentown. Within that organization they would enlist support of telegrams protesting or asking for clemency for the Rosenbergs, and on the Walter-McCarran Act they tried to organize meetings in protest of the Walter-McCarran Act.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall what position was held by Sylvia Freedland in the organization of the committee for justice to the Rosenbergs?

Mr. THOMAS. There weren't actually any officers to that group. The only thing is that Sylvia Freedland took the responsibility for the sending out of telegrams and disseminating the material received and work within the American Jewish Congress.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were the members of the Communist Party who actively participated in the work of the Rosenberg committee in Allentown?

Mr. THOMAS. Well, there was Irving Riskin, Adelaide Riskin, Harriet Karol, Sylvia Freedland, and myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether Ted Norton was actively engaged in that work?

Mr. THOMAS. He was engaged in the activity in Easton. I might say at this time that there is something comes to my recollection that there was a meeting of the section secretariat held in Kintnersville, Pa., on a Friday evening at which time Joseph Roberts was present and an individual who was the legislative director at one time for the Communist Party, nationally, who is now under indictment, a fellow by the name of Albert Emanuel Blumberg. At that meeting William Hood, who was the section organizer, made arrangements for a meeting the next day with Ted Norton and another individual. A few weeks later there appeared an editorial or letter written by Ted Norton in the Easton Express, and at a discussion later on at the section secretariat, it was brought up that Ted Norton had done the opposite of what the party had told me to do in reference to his way of work. This letter in the Easton Express more or less put Ted Norton on the spot as far as the party was concerned, and they felt that he shouldn't have done that which jeopardized his position at the college and so forth.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Billie Jane Lipsett active in Easton in the propaganda work being done in behalf of the Rosenbergs?

Mr. THOMAS. Her responsibility was for Easton, and how active she was I don't know. That is as far as she was concerned.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with efforts made by this group to raise money for the Rosenberg case?

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, yes; we raised money, the night that we had the meeting to form this committee, and then from time on, I recall one occasion where Sylvia Freedland called me and told me that they needed more money if I could possibly go out, and I think it was to round up about \$25 among some friends. I was not able to do it. She said that the committee in New York had called and that they needed money desperately, and we were to try to raise a certain amount in the Allentown area.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there a local group of the Civil Rights Congress in Allentown?

Mr. THOMAS. No, sir; there wasn't. Attempts made at one time to organize it, but there never was a local group of the Civil Rights Congress in Allentown.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there any organization of the Civil Rights Congress in the Lehigh Valley within the jurisdiction of your section committee?

Mr. THOMAS. No, sir; there wasn't. We raised money for Civil Rights Congress, but there wasn't an organization as such. I recall we had Howard Fast at one time at a meeting where we raised money to turn over to the Civil Rights Congress.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you say "we," to whom do you refer?

Mr. THOMAS. I mean the Communist Party at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. When money was raised by the Communist Party for front organizations, such as the Civil Rights Congress; what disposition was made of it?

Mr. THOMAS. At this one particular meeting we had raised a considerable sum of money, and there was a girl there from the Civil Rights Congress office who took the money. I recall at a later meeting of the section where Irving Riskin and myself both protested that we had worked so hard to organize the meeting, that a certain amount of that money should stay within the Communist Party in the Lehigh Valley.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it the practice of the Communist Party to retain for its purposes part of the funds raised in various campaigns?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; we always kept a certain percentage of the money raised, whether it was by the Communist Party organizations or Progressive Party. I recall one time we had a festival in Sellersville that was sponsored by a front organization, and we were told that a certain amount of the concession we had there would be turned over to us in the valley.

Mr. TAVENNER. By "us," you mean the Communist Party?

Mr. THOMAS. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was any uniform percentage recognized as the proper percentage which the Communist Party was to retain from these front drives?

Mr. THOMAS. Not that I recall. I do say that on this one occasion, this festival, we were told that we would have 30 percent of the proceeds of our booth, that is the Communist Party booth that was set up there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall the particular front organization involved in that drive?

Mr. THOMAS. I think it was the American Peace Crusade at that time. They held what they called a Brotherhood Festival.

Mr. TAVENNER. Therefore, uninformed people laboring under a desire to promote peace, would patronize such an affair and make contributions because they believed in peace, and they were actually contributing to the Communist Party?

Mr. THOMAS. That is the sole purpose of the Communist Party with these front organizations, and it is more or less a camouflage. When we couldn't go out and raise money in the name of the party, I gave receipts that were issued to me by William Hood's wife that had "Civil Rights Congress" on them that I signed in raising money for the Communist Party. That was in the Lehigh Valley.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you not consider that that was a fraud upon the public who were asked to make such contributions?

Mr. THOMAS. Do you think the Communist Party stops to realize whether it is a fraud or not, in perpetrating their ideas among the American people, or on the American people?

Mr. WILLIS. What do you think?

Mr. THOMAS. They don't stop at anything, whether it is today or tomorrow, or if it will take 50 years. They say we have to take 2 steps backward and 1 step forward.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall occasions where money raised for front organizations was delivered to Communist Party members on a higher level than those locally?

Mr. THOMAS. Well, the section organizer and I personally turned over money to Joseph Kuzma, that was raised in the Lehigh Valley section. When they had the drive to raise money for the defense of the nine Communists in Philadelphia, our quota in the Lehigh Valley was to raise \$3,000. Some of that money was raised in the name of the party, and some was solicited among friends and sympathizers of the party under the name of civil rights. And that money as I say was turned over to Joseph Kuzma, who at that time was organizational secretary of the Communist Party of eastern Pennsylvania and Delaware.

Chairman WALTER. Do you know how much in all was raised for the defense of these people?

Mr. THOMAS. Defense of the Rosenbergs?

Chairman WALTER. No; the nine Communists in Philadelphia.

Mr. THOMAS. I might say this. At a meeting that Joseph Kuzma was at, he told us that the party in eastern Pennsylvania and Delaware had to raise \$100,000. The part I get a big kick out of is the fact that the attorney for the Communists was supposed to volunteer his services, and now Joseph Kuzma told me in front of Irving Riskin and a few others, that McBride's, the attorney, fees would be \$60,000, and that \$40,000 would have to be raised for propaganda. It was at a meeting 2 days before I testified in Philadelphia where we discussed the raising of additional funds for the defense, so I might say that I think there was well over \$100,000 raised for the defense of the 9 Communist leaders.

Chairman WALTER. The fact of the matter is that the court appointed counsel on the representation that these people had no money.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, Congressman, at a meeting of the section secretariat, the Communist Party stated, and I don't want to go over the whole trial, but I would like to say this in enlightenment, that they could have gotten attorneys, and they said they could have, but if they would have gotten Communist Party attorneys who were sympathetic to the party, how could they bring their case before the public? But they figured it would arouse more attention in the press in that way, and they expected to get people on their side.

Chairman WALTER. So that the application for counsel because they could not retain anyone, not having any money, was a fraud, practiced upon the court?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall how the funds raised for the Rosenberg committee were handled?

Mr. THOMAS. At the first meeting, in the latter part of 1952, the moneys collected there were turned over to Irving Riskin. He took that money, and what he did with it I don't know. On several occasions I had collected moneys that I had turned over to this fellow by the name of "Jack," who was known as William Powers. I had turned money over to him, and he was the section organizer of the Communist Party of the Lehigh Valley section.

Mr. DOYLE. What total amount did you raise? I am interested because of your relationship to the party and the FBI.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, I think that I raised about \$30 in total. Although I had a dual role, so to speak, I just couldn't go out among people and raise money for the Rosenbergs.

Mr. TAVENNER. After this organizational meeting in the fall of 1952, at the home of Mrs. Sylvia Freedland, how was material brought in relating to the Rosenberg case, and how was it disposed of?

Mr. THOMAS. Well, most of the material, as I say, was brought in from Philadelphia, and sometimes by Michael Freedland or someone from the district committee coming up to speak at one of the section meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of what?

Mr. THOMAS. Of the Communist Party. Well then, at the section secretariat meeting, different members would be given the material to take to the different clubs, Communist Party clubs.

Mr. TAVENNER. Different members of the Communist Party?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. So you have the situation, of Communist Party members bringing the material from Philadelphia?

Mr. THOMAS. They did all of the work.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know where they obtained the material in Philadelphia?

Mr. THOMAS. Well, there was a drop in Philadelphia, that the party calls by the name of Rosa. I don't know who it is, and I don't know if it is a man or woman, but on several occasions Mike Freedland picked up material there, both party material, and material on the defense of the Rosenbergs. On one occasion, I picked up material at the home of Sherman Labovitz in Philadelphia. He was also one of the nine Communist leaders indicted in Philadelphia.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there any occasions when you delivered this material to Mrs. Freedland?

Mr. THOMAS. That I delivered material to Mrs. Freedland?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. No, it was mostly that I got it from their home.

Mr. TAVENNER. So you have the picture of members of the Communist Party obtaining the Rosenberg material from Communist Party sources in Philadelphia, and then Communist Party members disseminating it in Allentown?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you any knowledge of the way in which the work of that committee in Allentown, that is the Rosenberg committee or the Sobell committee has functioned since May of 1954?

Mr. THOMAS. I have no knowledge whatsoever as of May of 1954. I might say that I was still kept on the Daily Worker and Sunday Worker list, that I had my subscription paid until February of 1955, and from time to time in that paper there was activity to try to get release and new trial for Morton Sobell, and in fact it was just 2 weeks ago that I received a letter from the Sunday Worker, asking for a renewal of my subscription, that the Worker was an important weapon in my everyday working kit. I don't know, they probably didn't erase my name from the list in New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was extensive propaganda work for the Rosenbergs done in Allentown? That is, did it cover a broad field?

Mr. THOMAS. Well, I might say that on one occasion, Irving Riskin told me that he was instrumental in getting two ministers to conduct a Sunday sermon on the Rosenbergs, and there was a collection taken. I might say that it was pretty broad in the respect that different organizations took on the Rosenbergs. I think most of it was under the influence of the Community Party by members in the church, and on one occasion in Bethlehem where they were able to secure the signature of a minister in support of clemency for the Rosenbergs because this Communist Party member was a member of that particular church.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you ever told from any higher source in the Communist Party what the Communist Party sought to attain by its work in connection with the Rosenberg matter?

Mr. THOMAS. I might say that on June 19, 1953, the day of the evening that the Rosenbergs were executed, I was taking Joseph Kuzma from Allentown, Pa., to attend a Communist Party meeting in Atlantic City. We had the radio turned on, and after the execution took place he spoke of how brave the Rosenbergs were, and that this was just a plot on the part of the American monopolies to camouflage the real issues, so to speak, the Korean war, and so forth. He said that the Rosenbergs were loyal people.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that an indication to you that this leader in the Communist Party felt that the Communists had some propaganda purpose to accomplish in its work?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct. That was my feeling.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Chairman WALTER. Are there any questions, Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. I think early in your testimony, there was some discussion on the use of force and violence.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; I stated, I think, in the arrest of the nine leaders of the Communist Party, that they were indicted for advocating the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence.

Mr. DOYLE. Was that subject ever discussed in the cell of which you were a member as a bona fide member of the Communist Party in 1937 to 1939?

Mr. THOMAS. As to force and violence?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. No, not in the terms that you broadly speak of force and violence, but we were told to read certain books wherein it shows how the revolution—take for instance, the history of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union, and that book tells how the Russian revolution took place and also in a certain chapter in there at Lenin's death, where Stalin and a few of the other members of the Politburo pledged their support, that they wouldn't rest until there was international communism.

Mr. DOYLE. With reference to the term you were an FBI agent in the Communist Party, from April 1944 to May 6, 1954, was this subject of force and violence either directly or indirectly ever discussed in your presence in the Communist Party meetings?

Mr. THOMAS. Well, I might say, in September of 1950 I attended a meeting of the leadership at which Joseph Kuzma was present, and William Hood, the section organizer outlined to him the method we had taken for security of lowering the membership in the individual groups to 3 and 4, and that Joseph Kuzma asked me why my son wasn't in the party, and my son at that time was 18, and he was ready to go to college, and he wanted to take up law. Joseph Kuzma made a remark that when we take over, we won't have any use for lawyers from the bourgeois school, and you tell your son to take up engineering, as we will need engineers. And he made another remark to this effect, that the only way the workers can control their means of livelihood is when there is an overthrow of the Government by revolution and we take over. That was the only occasion I heard the word "overthrow" used.

Mr. DOYLE. What level of authority in the Communist Party was this Joseph Kuzma at that time?

Mr. THOMAS. He was organizational secretary of the Communist Party of eastern Pennsylvania and Delaware.

Mr. DOYLE. Where is he now?

Mr. THOMAS. Joseph Kuzma is out on bail, awaiting appeal. That is, along with the other eight defendants who were just sentenced a few weeks ago by the Honorable J. Cullen Ganey in the Federal court in Philadelphia.

Mr. DOYLE. I have one more question. I have never met you before, and I have never talked with you, and I am asking this question not knowing what your answer is going to be, or what your experience may have been. But preliminary to this question I want to say that I have asked this question at most of the committee hearings where I have been in attendance, and never yet have I heard any Communist, former or present, ever testify that in any Communist cell meeting the American flag was in evidence. Now I want to ask you the question, whether or not in any of these Communist meetings of Communist cells was there ever an American flag on display?

Mr. THOMAS. It might seem that we rehearsed this thing, but I recall in 1946 attending a section convention of the Communist Party

where they had draped over the podium, the hammer and sickle of the Soviet Union.

Mr. DOYLE. They had what?

Mr. THOMAS. Draped over the podium, the flag of the Soviet Union. But right after, I would say, in December of 1953, before I testified at the Smith Act trial in Philadelphia, there was a meeting held I think around 22d and Walnut, or 22d and Spruce Street, and the speaker was a writer from the Sunday Worker of the Communist Party, and then there was a big to-do about the fact that Minnie (Jessie) Schneiderman brought up the fact that they didn't have the American flag there, and they held up the meeting a half hour until someone went out and got the American flag. That is the only occasion I can recall that there was an American flag present.

Mr. DOYLE. And they had the Russian flag there, too?

Mr. THOMAS. No.

Mr. DOYLE. At that meeting?

Mr. THOMAS. That meeting was in 1946, and this was later.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I wish to congratulate you upon rendering the service you have to the United States of America by reason of your having been willing to enter the service of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and to have served your country in that manner. I suppose there might be some folks not 100 miles from here who would call you a stool pigeon. I am sure there are. But, of course, I, as a Member of Congress, have come to feel from my own experience that the man or woman who enters the ranks of the Government through the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to help uncover and expose international conspiracy to subvert the American form of constitutional government is doing a service to his country, whether he is called a stool pigeon or a dozen stool pigeons. I wish to compliment you on the service you have rendered your country in that manner and in coming and helping us this morning.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you.

Mr. WILLIS. I want to join in that statement without repeating it, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WALTER. Mr. Thomas, I, too, wish to congratulate you. It is impossible to appraise the value of work done by you and other brave people like you in this fight against international communism. When people have the courage to come forward and point out how good Americans are duped by worthy causes and think they are participating in what might be a worthy cause, I think that it serves a very useful purpose, and I cannot congratulate you enough for what you have done.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

I think we will take a break of 5 minutes at this time.

(A brief recess was taken by the committee.)

Chairman WALTER. The committee will be in order.

Do you have another witness, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Sylvia Freedland.

Chairman WALTER. Will you raise your right hand, please?

Do you swear that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. FREEDLAND. I do.

**TESTIMONY OF MRS. SYLVIA FREEDLAND, ACCOMPANIED BY
COUNSEL, DAVID REIN**

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you Mrs. Sylvia Freedland?

Mrs. FREEDLAND. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted that you are accompanied by counsel, and will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. REIN. David Rein, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you reside, Mrs. Freedland?

Mrs. FREEDLAND. 230 South 16th Street, Allentown, Pa.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in Allentown?

Mrs. FREEDLAND. About 5 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were you born?

Mrs. FREEDLAND. New York City.

Mr. TAVENNER. From what city did you move when you came to Allentown about 5 years ago?

Mrs. FREEDLAND. Philadelphia.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long had you lived in Philadelphia?

Mrs. FREEDLAND. Practically all of my life.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been?

Mrs. FREEDLAND. I went to high school in Philadelphia. I attended the University of Pennsylvania, and received a degree of bachelor of arts, and then took a graduate course at the Drexel Institute, also in Philadelphia, and received a degree of bachelor of science in library science.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you receive that degree?

Mrs. FREEDLAND. In 1939.

Mr. TAVENNER. What employment have you had since that time?

Mrs. FREEDLAND. I worked at the Lansdowne Public Library.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where?

Mrs. FREEDLAND. That is a suburb of Philadelphia, and I worked at the Philadelphia City Institute Library.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you done any library work in Allentown?

Mrs. FREEDLAND. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been engaged in any occupation in Allentown?

Mrs. FREEDLAND. I am a housewife and mother of three children.

Mr. TAVENNER. And you have not engaged in any occupation?

Mrs. FREEDLAND. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Other than being a housewife in Allentown?

Mrs. FREEDLAND. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Freedland, do you recall a meeting held in your home in the fall of 1952 attended by Mr. Thomas, the preceding witness, Mr. Irving Riskin, and others, relating to the Rosenberg case?

Mrs. FREEDLAND. I decline to answer under my privilege of the fifth amendment against testifying against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you held any official position with the Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case in Allentown?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mrs. FREEDLAND. I don't know whether there was such a committee in Allentown.

MR. TAVENNER. Mr. Thomas has testified that there was no formal organization which had officers, but he advised the committee a few moments ago that you were active in the work, and assumed certain responsibilities in connection with the work of that group. Is that correct?

Mrs. FREEDLAND. Just a moment.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mrs. FREEDLAND. I invoke my privilege and decline to answer.

MR. TAVENNER. Approximately, how far is Bethlehem from Allentown?

Mrs. FREEDLAND. Do you mean how many miles?

MR. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mrs. FREEDLAND. I really don't know, maybe 7 or 8, I don't know. It is very near.

MR. TAVENNER. Have you attended meetings, closed meetings of the Communist Party at the Professional Club of the Communist Party in Bethlehem?

Mrs. FREEDLAND. I decline to answer that question, under my privilege.

MR. TAVENNER. Have you been a member of the Communist Party during the period from the fall of 1952 on up to the present time?

Mrs. FREEDLAND. I decline to answer that.

MR. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party prior to the fall of 1952?

Mrs. FREEDLAND. I invoke my privilege.

MR. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. FREEDLAND. I decline to answer that on the basis of the fifth amendment.

MR. TAVENNER. Do you know whether Mr. Irving Riskin was active in work in behalf of the Rosenbergs in Allentown?

Mrs. FREEDLAND. I decline to answer that on the basis of the fifth amendment.

MR. TAVENNER. Did you at any time work with Mr. Riskin in the raising of funds for any purpose?

Mrs. FREEDLAND. I decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

MR. TAVENNER. Did you organize the distribution of Rosenberg propaganda information and material in Allentown?

Mrs. FREEDLAND. I decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

MR. TAVENNER. Have you been engaged during the year of 1955 in work in the dissemination of documents, pamphlets, or other material relating to Morton Sobell?

Mrs. FREEDLAND. I decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

MR. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOYLE. I have no questions.

MR. WILLIS. I have no questions.

Chairman WALTER. The witness is excused.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Adelaide Riskin.

Chairman WALTER. Will you raise your right hand, please?

Do you swear that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. RISKIN. I do.

**TESTIMONY OF MRS. ADELAIDE RISKIN, ACCOMPANIED BY
COUNSEL, DAVID REIN**

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

Mrs. RISKIN. Adelaide Riskin. R-i-s-k-i-n.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted that the witness is accompanied by the same counsel who accompanied the preceding witness.

Where do you reside, Mrs. Riskin?

Mrs. RISKIN. 329 North 22d Street, Allentown, Pa.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in Allentown?

Mrs. RISKIN. Approximately the last 9 years, and I was born in Allentown.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you live prior to 9 years ago?

Mrs. RISKIN. In Detroit, Mich.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you live in Detroit?

Mrs. RISKIN. Approximately 5 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your employment in Detroit?

Mrs. RISKIN. I worked for 1 year at Plymouth Motors.

Mr. TAVENNER. What year was that?

Mrs. RISKIN. Offhand I couldn't say. I couldn't recall. While in Detroit I also worked for about a year for the department of public welfare as a student caseworker.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee when that was, please?

Mrs. RISKIN. I would say that it was about 1953—no, it was 1943.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your next employment in Detroit?

Mrs. RISKIN. Those were the only two.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you engaged in any occupation other than that of being a housewife in Allentown?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mrs. RISKIN. Not on a full-time basis. I have done some part-time work.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the nature of that work?

Mrs. RISKIN. Marketing research.

Mr. TAVENNER. Employed by whom?

Mrs. RISKIN. Well, employed by various marketing research agencies, such as McCann, Erickson, for example.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time worked for the United States Government?

Mrs. RISKIN. I worked for the Department of Agriculture in Washington, D. C.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was that?

Mrs. RISKIN. Without real surety, I would say approximately it was 1940 and 1941.

Mr. TAVENNER. In working there, did you use your present name?

Mrs. RISKIN. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you use your maiden name?

Mrs. RISKIN. When I worked for the Department of Agriculture my maiden name; I was not married then.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, what was your maiden name?

Mrs. RISKIN. Adelaide Schiff.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, what was your position in the Agriculture Department?

Mrs. RISKIN. I don't recall the actual title, and I think I was what would be called a clerk-typist.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee please, what your formal educational training has been?

Mrs. RISKIN. Yes; I am a graduate of the University of Maryland.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you receive your degree there?

Mrs. RISKIN. In 1938.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether or not you were actively engaged with a group in Allentown in work in behalf of the Rosenbergs?

Mrs. RISKIN. I invoke my privilege under the fifth amendment not to testify against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Therefore you refuse to answer?

Mrs. RISKIN. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you engaged in any fund drives by yourself or in collaboration with others for the benefit of the Rosenbergs?

Mrs. RISKIN. Again I invoke my privilege.

Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer that question.

Mrs. RISKIN. Will you repeat the question, please?

Chairman WALTER. Read the question, please.

The REPORTER (reading) :

Have you engaged in any fund drives by yourself or in collaboration with others for the benefit of the Rosenbergs?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mrs. RISKIN. I stick to my privilege, and I refuse to answer that.

Chairman WALTER. That is all.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

Call your next witness, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Jean D. Frantjis.

Chairman WALTER. Will you raise your right hand, please?

Do you swear that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. I do.

TESTIMONY OF MRS. JEAN D. FRANTJIS, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, DAVID REIN

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. My name is Jean D. Frantjis. F-r-a-n-t-j-i-s.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted that the witness is accompanied by the same counsel who accompanied the preceding witness.

Where do you reside, Mrs. Frantjis?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. I live in Philadelphia, Pa.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in Philadelphia?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. Almost all of my life.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee please what your formal educational training has been?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. I am a graduate of high school. Following my graduation I followed up with extracurricula courses with a business college.

Mr. TAVENNER. What business college?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. The YM and YWHA.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us what those initials mean?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. Young Men's and Young Women's Hebrew Association.

Mr. TAVENNER. Any other formal educational training?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. I have continued my schooling at the Benjamin Franklin Evening High School, which is a public educational center for adults.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you finished?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What occupation or profession have you followed, Mrs. Frantjis?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. In the main, business employment, although I have done social work, too.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where have you done social work? By that I mean where were you employed to do social work.

Mrs. FRANTJIS. I worked for the Jewish Children's Bureau.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was that?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. Well, I have been working since 1926, and that would mean approximately 29 years of employment.

Chairman WALTER. Was that in Philadelphia?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. Yes. So that I couldn't possibly give you dates except to say that I was employed there. It was 29 years of employment. It is a great deal to note.

Mr. TAVENNER. What other type of employment have you had?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. I have worked for building and construction, and I have worked for the Pennsylvania Railroad.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the type of work that you did for the Pennsylvania Railroad?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. It was clerical and business training.

*Mr. TAVENNER. Requiring statistical training? I mean that type of work?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. I needed clerical office training.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the work of a statistical character that you were doing?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. No, I would say no.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you engaged in any work that a statistician would normally do.

Mrs. FRANTJIS. I am not a statistician and I could not therefore engage in that kind of work.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you reside in Philadelphia?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. I reside at 249 South Melya Street.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you lived at other addresses in the city of Philadelphia?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. May I consult counsel?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mrs. FRANTJIS. Well, since I was born in Philadelphia, I would have to start from the beginning, and that would be very difficult.

However, during my married life, which is some 22 years, I have lived in about 3 or 4 or 5 places. The longest being my present address where I have resided for 11 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you live prior to that?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. At 5856 Spruce Street.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to that time, where did you live?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. At 56 North Felton Street.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you live there?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. Well, I will have to go back from 11 years. Probably it was 15 years ago.

Mr. TAVENNER. That would be about 1940?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. Yes, since it is 1955 now.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you known by any other name than that of "Jean" as a first name? What is your first name?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. Jean, J-e-a-n.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you known by any other name than "Jean" as a first name?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever used the name of "Matilda"?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. I have used it simply because that is my name. However, my parents registered me on birth, and as a youngster I just felt that the full name of "Tilly" was "Matilda," and I did just as any other young person would use "Robert" instead of "Bob." I learned that that actually wasn't my name. It is Jean. That is on record at the city hall, when I was born.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you also used the name "Matilda"?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. I did up to a certain point, in my teens.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you engaged in any occupation or business at this time?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. I am not employed at the present time.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your last employment?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. May I consult counsel?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a photostatic copy of a nomination paper of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which was circulated by an individual, and a number of signers obtained to support candidates on the Communist Party ticket for the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in the year 1940. An affidavit is given at the end of that list by a person by the name of Matilda D. Frantjis, residence 58 North Felton Street, Philadelphia, Pa. And that also the name of the first signature on the list is that of Matilda Frantjis, Philadelphia, North Felton Street, No. 58. Will you examine it, and state whether or not you circulated that nomination paper?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. May I consult with my counsel?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mrs. FRANTJIS. I invoke my privilege of the fifth amendment in this question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the document in evidence and ask that it be marked "Frantjis Exhibit No. 1" for identification purposes only and made a part of the committee files.

Chairman WALTER. It is so ordered.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party in 1940?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. I invoke the privilege of the fifth amendment not to testify against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time attended a convention or conventions of the Communist Party in the city of Philadelphia?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. I invoke the privilege of the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a photostatic copy of a circular letter bearing the date of December 19, 1952, on the letterhead of the Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case. Will you examine the signature at the end of the letter and state whether or not it is your signature?

(The document was handed to the witness.)

Mrs. FRANTJIS. I invoke the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. What name do you see signed at the closing of the letter?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mrs. FRANTJIS. Jean D. Frantjis.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you compose the letter appearing above the name "Jean D. Frantjis"?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. I invoke the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted that under the name of Jean D. Frantjis, appears the word "secretary." Were you the secretary of the Philadelphia Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case in 1952?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. Sir, I do not believe that you have a right to ask me this question, and I think it deals with a matter of speech and association.

Chairman WALTER. Are you going to answer the question, or are you not going to answer it?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. Yes, I will answer the question—by invoking the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of any committee working in behalf of Morton Sobell?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. I invoke the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted on the letterhead that the executive secretary of the national organization is David Alman. Do you know who its president is, and was?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. President of what?

Mr. TAVENNER. Of the Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case.

Mrs. FRANTJIS. What committee?

Mr. TAVENNER. The National Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mrs. FRANTJIS. I invoke my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask for a direction?

Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer that question.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mrs. FRANTJIS. I stick to the privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. The name of the president does not appear on the letterhead of the Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case. I ask you again, who was its president?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. I invoke the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think there should be a direction Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer the last question.

Mrs. FRANTJIS. I stick to my privilege, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have before me a photostatic copy of an article appearing in the Evening Bulletin, a newspaper in Philadelphia, the issue of October 15, 1952, the heading of which is "200 Donate \$1,200 for Doomed Spies." In the course of the article, I find this paragraph:

The meeting was called by the Philadelphia Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case. Mrs. Jean D. Frantjis is secretary of the local group.

Will you examine it please and state whether or not you were correctly reported as the secretary of the group?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. Excuse me.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mrs. FRANTJIS. I invoke the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the document in evidence and ask it be marked as "Frantjis Exhibit No. 2," for identification only, and made a part of the committee files.

Chairman WALTER. It will be so marked and received.

Mr. TAVENNER. The article shows that \$1,200 was donated at a money-raising rally at Town Hall in behalf of Ethel and Julius Rosenberg. Did you make arrangements for the renting or the leasing of that hall? That is for the meeting in October of 1952?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. I invoke the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was \$1,200 donated for the purposes indicated at the meeting to which I referred?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. I invoke the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee what was done with the \$1,200, or any other sum raised at the meeting at Town Hall, in October of 1952?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. I invoke the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was David Alman a speaker at that meeting?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. I invoke the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did David Alman at that meeting state publicly that he was a close neighbor of the Rosenbergs, and knew them very well?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. I invoke the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a member of the Communist Party at this time?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. I cannot be a party to a conspiracy of which I consider this committee to be a part, to destroy the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, and you have no need to ask into my political beliefs.

Chairman WALTER. Answer the question. Are you a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. FRANTJIS. I invoke the first and fifth amendments of the Constitution.

Chairman WALTER. You are excused.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

The committee will stand in recess until 2 o'clock.

(Thereupon, at 12:30 p. m., the committee recessed, to reconvene at 2 p. m., the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION, AUGUST 3, 1955

(The subcommittee reconvened at 2 p. m.)

Chairman WALTER. The committee will come to order.

Call your witness, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to recall Mr. Thomas.

TESTIMONY OF HERMAN E. THOMAS—Resumed

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you Mr. Herman E. Thomas?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you testify before the committee this morning?

Mr. THOMAS. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you in the hearing room during the testimony of Mrs. Jean D. Frantjis?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you hear her testify?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have an opportunity to observe her when she was on the witness stand?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, sir; I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time attended a meeting of the Communist Party at which she was present?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, sir; I was to 1 or 2 conventions of the party held in Philadelphia, large district committee meetings, at which time she was present.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were those meetings open to the public or were they closed Communist Party meetings?

Mr. THOMAS. They were closed Communist Party affairs—meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was this in the city of Philadelphia?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you fix the approximate period over which those meetings were held?

Mr. THOMAS. I recall in 1946, I think, a convention, and I would say in the period 1946 to 1949. After that time there were no conventions of the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is all.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

Chairman WALTER. Call your next witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Theodore Norton, will you come forward, please?

Chairman WALTER. Will you raise your right hand?

Do you swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. NORTON. I do.

**TESTIMONY OF THEODORE E. NORTON ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL
WILLIAM ALLEN RAHILL**

Mr. TAVENNER. State your full name.

Mr. NORTON. Theodore E. Norton.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted that you are accompanied by counsel. Will counsel please identify himself for the benefit of the record?

Mr. RAHILL. Yes; I am William Allen Rahill, 2730 Lewis Tower Building, Philadelphia 2, Pa.

Mr. Chairman, may I make a brief statement for the record regarding the subpoenas served in this matter?

Chairman WALTER. No; we do not allow that. You can raise whatever question you care to—

Mr. RAHILL. I think it is relevant in that the subpoena was addressed to Mr. Norton at no address.

Chairman WALTER. It is not relevant at all.

Mr. RAHILL. I think it is relevant because we voluntarily called Mr. Tavenner and arranged to be here if we were the party intended.

Chairman WALTER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Has a second subpoena been served on you. One was sent to the United States marshal.

Mr. RAHILL. Yes; a second subpoena was served.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the point?

Mr. RAHILL. To show that Mr. Norton cooperated, anyway.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where and when were you born?

Mr. NORTON. In Tacoma, Wash., May 29, 1899.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. NORTON. Easton, Pa.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in Easton?

Mr. NORTON. Twenty-four years.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession or occupation?

Mr. NORTON. Librarian.

Mr. TAVENNER. College librarian?

Mr. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, of what your formal educational training has consisted?

Mr. NORTON. I hold a bachelor of arts degree from the University of Washington, 1923; master of arts degree, librarian of science, University of Michigan, 1928. That might be 1929.

Mr. TAVENNER. What position did you go to Easton to fulfill?

Mr. NORTON. The librarianship of Lafayette College.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you held that position until a comparatively recent date?

Mr. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Norton, have you been a member of the Communist Party at any time while living at Easton?

Mr. NORTON. I request my constitutional privilege not to be compelled to be a witness against myself.

(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you identified with any movement in your area to disseminate information or propaganda relating to the Rosenberg trials?

(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. NORTON. I invoke my right under the fifth amendment not to be compelled to be a witness against myself.

(At this point Mr. Doyle left the committee room.)

(At this point Mr. Moulder entered the committee room.)

Chairman WALTER. What was that question?

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you read the question?

The REPORTER (reading):

Were you identified with any movement in your area to disseminate information or propaganda relating to the Rosenberg trials?

Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer that question.

(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. NORTON. I invoke my right under the Constitution of the United States not to be compelled to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you participate in any fund drives for either the national or a local organization for the benefit of the Rosenbergs?

(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. NORTON. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have any knowledge of how funds were raised for that purpose?

(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. NORTON. I have no firsthand knowledge.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you assist in any manner in setting up an organization for the purpose of handling the business of propaganda support for the benefit of the Rosenbergs?

(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. NORTON. No.

Mr. MOULDER. You say you had no firsthand knowledge. Do you have any knowledge of any nature whatsoever?

(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. NORTON. I don't recall, sir, but I think I may have received some solicitations in the mail.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the source of that solicitation?

(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. NORTON. I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. What did you do in aiding or supporting the dissemination of propaganda relating to the Rosenberg case?

(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. NORTON. I mailed out two pamphlets and I have them here and would like to submit them for incorporation in the transcript of this hearing.

Mr. RAHILL. May they be identified for the benefit of the record?

Chairman WALTER. Will you direct your questions to the Chair?

Mr. RAHILL. Excuse me, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAVENNER. One of the documents handed me by the witness is entitled "Mercy for the Rosenbergs," published by the National Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case.

The second is entitled "The Rosenberg Case, a Fact Sheet," published by the National Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case.

Chairman WALTER. Did you request that they be made a part of the record?

Mr. RAHILL. The witness did, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WALTER. Yes; let them be made a part of the record.

(Norton Exhibits Nos. 1 and 2, respectively, are as follows:)

NORTON EXHIBIT No. 1

MERCY for the ROSENBERGS

By ABRAHAM CRONBACH

Dr. Cronbach is a distinguished rabbi and scholar. He is a former professor of Social Science and the author of several books on peace. Rabbi Cronbach is the Honorary Chairman of the Jewish Peace Fellowship.

Published by

THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO SECURE JUSTICE
IN THE ROSENBERG CASE

1050 Sixth Avenue, New York 18, N. Y.

THE American people are a merciful people. American sympathies are ever awakened by human suffering. In a thousand ways, among which our vast benevolences furnish glorious examples, Americans have demonstrated that they are warm-hearted and not hard-hearted. Brotherhood is our ideal, recurrently acclaimed within our several religions as well as by our unchurched. All of us have, at times, fallen short of those ideals. But, deep in our souls, we cherish those ideals. Rare is the American who does not honor mercy and does not revere brotherhood.

Also among American ideals is that of loyalty to the United States. Sometimes religious ideals and national ideals conflict, and devout people occasionally affirm that there is a law of God which is higher than the law of the state. This is not our own position. Most of us defer to the laws of the state without reservation. The laws of the state should be obeyed. To the laws of the state, everyone owes allegiance.

Julius and Ethel Rosenberg have been convicted of a law violation. Large numbers of people look upon this conviction as unjust, like the conviction of Leo Frank or Alfred Dreyfus or others who, though pronounced guilty, were subsequently proved innocent. Some deem Julius and Ethel Rosenberg innocent. There are also those who, while non-committal as to the couple's guilt or innocence, do nonetheless insist that the trial was unfairly conducted. Persons versed in the law have pointed out what they regard as improprieties in the proceedings. But we shall waive all this. Let us concede that Julius and Ethel Rosenberg did commit the crime with which they are charged. Let us grant that the trial entailed no breach of justice. Still, is it compatible with the finest in the American spirit that Julius and Ethel Rosenberg be put to death?

It is argued that, through the betrayal of atomic secrets by the Rosenbergs, Russia gained a military advantage. That the act alleged of the Rosenbergs imparted to Russia any military advantage has, by no means, been proved. But granted that such advantage for Russia might have ensued, others convicted of the identical crime—Fuchs, Greenglass, Gold, Sobell, Slack, Simons, May, Brothman—have not been sentenced to die: they have been sentenced to terms of imprisonment. If the death penalty was, in those other cases, not requisite for our national defense, why should it be so regarded in the case of the Rosenbergs?

UNIQUE FACTORS

THE misdeed imputed to the Rosenbergs is said to have had its inception in 1944 and 1945. At that time, the United States and Russia were allies. It is difficult to see why Russia should, at that time, have found espionage at all necessary. The United States was, at that time, sharing its military secrets with Russia as it was with England and with Canada. As matter of public record, Harry Hopkins himself, at that period, mediated the transfer of nuclear materials to the Soviets. The law against atomic espionage does not, it is true, distinguish between a friendly power and a hostile power. It forbids the betrayal of atomic secrets to any foreign power. But must the punishment be made equally severe in both

instances? There is a huge difference between a friendly power and a hostile power. In the breadth of that difference, is there no room for mercy?

The law violation of which the Rosenbergs are accused is alleged to have occurred at a time when the atomic bomb was unknown to everyone except a few highly trained experts; it was prior to Hiroshima. The day after Hiroshima, all of us knew about the atomic bomb. Previous to Hiroshima, none of us knew. Even if the Rosenbergs did conspire to betray atomic secrets, they could not possibly have comprehended the import of what they were doing. Clemency to the Rosenbergs can, in no way, constitute a precedent against the death sentence for future infractions. The factors in the case are utterly unique. Never can those same factors recur.

All of this applies regardless of what might be said about the people by whom the Rosenbergs are being aided. Among those seeking to save the Rosenbergs are people of all political parties, several religious cults, and various walks of life. All of them are people like the reader and the writer of these words, Americans whose interests lie in America, who have everything to gain if America gains and everything to lose if America loses. By no stretch of the imagination, can any friend of the Rosenbergs, in any way, profit by anything through which America is injured.

The sinister word "Communism" has entered into the situation. There are words which, by a kind of fatal spell, dissipate thought and generate fury. Among such words, "Communism" plays at present a dreadful role. The word conveys so many different meanings that it has become almost void of meaning but, the less meaning a word holds, the greater sometimes its potency for passions which unbalance thinking.

THE OMINOUS WORD

LONG before the cold war began, a communist was understood to be someone who aims to overthrow the United States government "by force and violence." Our imbroglio with Russia has, during the last seven years, woefully intensified this charge. A communist is now asserted to be someone who promotes the interests of Russia in opposition to the interests of the United States. Would it be out of place to ask the reader: Have you ever met anyone who advocated the overthrow of the United States? Have you ever read any book, article or pamphlet which urged such overthrow? Have you ever heard any public speaker recommend such overthrow? It is sometimes maintained that people harbor such designs but keep them secret, forbearing to express them openly. Yet how can we possibly know anyone's unexpressed thoughts? With equal warrant, one might accuse, of clandestine subversiveness, Dwight Eisenhower, Adlai E. Stevenson, Harry S. Truman or Robert A. Taft. Still, let us suppose that the friends of the Rosenbergs consist only of traitors. How does that touch the merits of the Rosenberg case? How does that alter the preciousness of mercy? Must the Rosenbergs suffer because of the sins of their friends?

The truth will have to be sought in the sinuosities of the human mind. Every life is beset with frustrations. All of us suffer vexation and disappointment. Psychologists have studied the tendency of organisms, whether human or animal, to retaliate for frustrations by striking back. If the organism can not reach its real offender, it attacks some substitute, some "displacement," as the psychologists call it; like the man who, reprimanded by his employer, yet not daring to answer his employer, comes home and vents his spleen on his wife and his children; or like the boy who resented the domination of his father but, powerless to get even with his father, waited twenty-five years and shot down "Father" Abraham. That boy's name was John Wilkes Booth. This displacement of grievances is a familiar psychological phenomenon. Unable to get at those who are the real causes of our woes, we wreak vengeance on scapegoats.

OUR BASIC TROUBLE

FOR some people, the scapegoat is the Jew. For others, it is the Catholic. For still others, it is the "capitalists" or "Wall Street." The favorite scapegoat of the present hour is the "communists." This does not deny that there really are people who call themselves communists and who feverishly advance extreme theories about the obligations of the privileged toward the under-privileged. Most of us Americans dissent from those theories, even though the Republican Party and the Democratic Party to which we belong may count, among their followers, people holding views but slightly less radical. The fact is that the opinions propounded by the communists have little to do with the conflict. Communism is, for us, hardly a vehicle of political or economic ideas. It has grown to be an unconscious symbol of the troubles which embitter our lives.

Regrettably the Rosenberg case has become implicated with that deadly word. Were the case to be judged on its merits, a great swell of protest would arise against the sentence of death. Public opinion would encourage and support the President in commuting the sentence.* The issue has unhappily gotten entangled in clichés which cause Americans to forget that Americans are merciful.


One is reminded of the adage, "Know thyself." If we would look deeply into our souls, we might find that our troubles are rooted not in the "communists" but in the frustrations of our private lives. Once aware of this, we would recall words spoken more than nine decades ago by the noblest American of them all. Ours would then be the hope that America's splendid ideals of mercy and of brotherhood will yet reign within all hearts "when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature."

* The case can not come before the President until all juridical expedients have been exhausted. The Committee to Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case is engaged in raising funds to finance an appeal to the Supreme Court and, if granted, a new trial.

NORTON EXHIBIT No. 2

THE ROSENBERG CASE

a fact sheet



Published by
**THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO
SECURE JUSTICE IN THE
ROSENBERG CASE**

1050 Sixth Ave., New York 18, N Y

CONCLUSIONS

THE
TAINT OF
ANTISEMITISMTHE
DEATH
SENTENCEAN ARGUMENT
FOR FOREIGN POLICY
INSTEAD OF EVIDENCEPOSDICS INSTEAD
OF EVIDENCETHE STAR
WITNESSESTHE
PROSECUTION'S
CASETHE
INDICTMENT

On April 5, 1951, Julius Rosenberg and his wife Ethel were sentenced to die in the electric chair, having been convicted on a charge of conspiracy to spy on behalf of the Soviet Union.

The Rosenbergs have unswervingly maintained their innocence from the day of their arrest. When Ethel Rosenberg was taken to the Sing Sing death house, she declared:

"We said and we say again that we are victims of the grossest type of political frame-up ever known in America."

On February 25, 1952, the U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the verdict and the sentences in a shocking decision that held, among other things, that persons could be considered disposed to commit espionage by virtue of their political or social views. The defendants' attorneys will appeal the case to the Supreme Court.

Thousands of people, among them many eminent public figures, do not believe the Rosenbergs guilty or that their trial was a fair one. Thousands more, who have grave doubts of their guilt, are horrified at the death sentence.

A number of these citizens have formed the National Committee to Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case, and many times their number have contributed money and time to make new appeals possible and to bring the case, with its far-flung implications, to the public.

THE ROSENBERGS

Ethel and Julius Rosenberg, until their arrest, led the life of every-day people, struggling for a livelihood and education, and hoping that their two young sons, aged nine and four, would be spared the hardships familiar to the parents.

Julius Rosenberg, 34, was born and raised on the lower East Side of New York City. He attended public school and Seward Park High School as well as the Downtown Talmud Torah and Hebrew High School. He graduated from the City College of New York in 1939 with a Bachelor's Degree in Engineering.

Ethel Rosenberg, 36, graduated from Seward Park High School, and took courses in bookkeeping, stenography, typing, Hebrew, piano, guitar, and voice, and a course in child psychology at the New School for Social Research. They lived in an apartment on the lower East Side for which they paid approximately \$45 a month. Since their marriage they lived solely on Julius' \$70 a-week income as a government engineer, except for the past few years when they managed a meager living from the profits of a small machine shop business. Julius was an active member of his trade union. Ethel did volunteer work in community and civilian defense organizations.

THE INDICTMENT

The indictment charged the Rosenbergs with initiating a conspiracy during 1944, the last year of the war against nazism, to transmit information "relating to the national defense of the United States" to the Soviet Union.

The prosecutor however, went far beyond the indictment, charged that the

Rosenbergs had given the Soviet Union the "secret" of the atom bomb, and attempted to create the impression that the Rosenbergs were "Communists," holding allegedly "subversive" views, and therefore disposed to commit espionage. He further attempted to impress the jury that a verdict of "innocent" would be tantamount to repudiation of our government's foreign policy.

THE PROSECUTION'S CASE

Before the trial the prosecutor announced that he would call 118 witnesses, among them top scientists Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, Dr. Harold C. Urey; Gen. Leslie R. Groves, head of the atom bomb project during the war; agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; alleged associates of the Rosenbergs in the "conspiracy"; and two "star" witnesses. All witnesses were supposed to give evidence of Rosenberg's alleged spy activities.

Of these 118, the prosecutor called only 20, among them none of the above named scientists or FBI agents. Of the 20, 8 merely gave details of a trip which Sobell took to Mexico, a trip which the prosecutor did not allege to be for espionage purposes: 1 testified to security measures taken at the Los Alamos project; 1 explained a lens mold drawn for the trial by Greenglass; 1 was an engineer who interpreted a sketch and a report concerning the atom bomb submitted by Greenglass; 1 was the Rosenberg family doctor who testified that Rosenberg had asked him questions pertaining to inoculations necessary for a trip to Mexico; 1 was a relative of Ruth Greenglass, who testified that David had given him \$4000 to hold for him; 1 was the sister of Ruth Greenglass who testified that she was once asked to leave the room by Julius Rosenberg on a visit to the Greenglass home; 1 was a witness who identified a photograph of Anatoli Yakovlev, a former Soviet consular aide named a co-defendant in the trial, and who had returned to his country in December 1946; 1 was Elizabeth Bentley, who in effect contended that all communists were spies, but had never met any of the defendants; 1 was Harry Gold, who, admitting that he had never known or seen or been involved in any way with the Rosenbergs or Sobell, luridly described his own espionage activities. Of the remaining 3 witnesses, 1 said that Rosenberg had on two occasions made espionage overtures to him, but he had declined each time. This witness, Max Elitcher, admitted that he faced a five year prison sentence for perjury, that he had been threatened by FBI agents with prosecution for espionage, and that he "hoped for the best" as a result of his uncorroborated testimony. He is free today, never having been tried. The remaining two witnesses, David and Ruth Greenglass, were both, according to the prosecutor, and their own statements, involved in the alleged conspiracy, but as a result of their testimony, of which more later, Ruth was never brought to trial, and her husband got off with a 15 year sentence.

The government's entire case is based on the Greenglass's uncorroborated testimony, a fact conceded by the Court of Appeals, which in upholding the convictions declared that without the testimony of the Greenglasses, "the conviction could not stand." The prosecutor produced 32 exhibits as "documentary evidence." Not one of these documents, by the prosecutor's own admission, connected the Rosenbergs with a conspiracy to commit espionage. In fact, only two of the documents had any link whatever to the Rosenbergs.

One was a collection can issued by the Spanish Refugee Appeal, the other was a nominating petition, signed by Ethel, for Peter V. Cacchione, a successful Communist candidate for the City Council of New York.

The prosecutor filled the overwhelming bulk of his case with persistent insinuations that the Rosenbergs were Communists, that U. S. monopoly of the atom bomb was important to world peace, and that war with the Soviet Union was virtually inevitable.

THE STAR WITNESSES

David Greenglass, brother of Ethel Rosenberg, and his wife Ruth, were the star witnesses against the Rosenbergs. Both admitted that they had committed espionage for which they received money and for which both could be given the death penalty.

David Greenglass was arrested in June and indicted in July 1950. He was held in \$100,000 bail, placed in solitary confinement, and visited for hours at a time by the FBI.

He and Ruth hired O. John Rogge, who himself later became a star government witness against the eminent Negro scholar Dr. W. E. B. DuBois in a case charging Dr. DuBois with being a foreign agent (the judge threw the case out of court). After extended negotiations by the Greenglasses, Rogge, Prosecutor Irving Saypol and agents of the Department of Justice, The FBI arrested Julius Rosenberg and later his wife Ethel solely on the basis of "information" given by the Greenglasses.

The Greenglass' uncorroborated testimony was the only evidence presented that the Rosenbergs had conspired to steal the atom-bomb secret. Their testimony in respect to the Rosenbergs was solely oral, and no documents or other proofs linking the Rosenbergs to espionage were introduced. No witnesses were called to substantiate any conversations on espionage that allegedly took place between the Greenglasses and the Rosenbergs. David Greenglass testified that relying solely on his memory of snatches of overheard conversation at the atom-bomb project at Los Alamos, and his remembrance of details of blueprints which had been shown to him as part of his work as a machinist, he had drawn up an elaborate sketch of the atom bomb, together with twelve pages of written material, which he allegedly conveyed as a description of the bomb to Rosenberg.

The following are Greenglass' actual qualifications for this impressive feat:

- 1) experience as an ordinary machinist in both army and civilian life;
- 2) a high school education, plus 8 technical courses at Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute, in all 8 of which he admitted he was graded "failure";
- 3) an admission that he was ignorant of the formulae governing component parts of the atom bomb, and that he had never taken courses or read books on such essential subjects as elementary, differential or advanced calculus, thermodynamics, quantum mechanics, nuclear or atomic physics. Not a single atomic scientist was called to support David Greenglass' testimony concerning the atom bomb or to confirm the authenticity of the "sketch" of the atom bomb he made for the trial. Instead, John Derry, assigned as a First Lieutenant, an aide to General Groves, whose job in the Army was

mainly related to personnel, was called upon to testify that the manufactured sketch reflected to a "substantial degree" the principles of the atom bomb. Derry's sole "qualification" was a Bachelor of Engineering degree.

Had Dr. Harold C. Urey been called by the prosecutor, as the latter had announced he would do, Dr. Urey could have demolished Greenglass' testimony by repeating what he had said on March 3, 1946, during Congressional hearings on whether the atom bomb should be controlled by civilians or the Army. The N. Y. Times reports him as saying: *"Detailed data on the atomic bomb, he declared, would require '80 to 90 volumes of close print' which only a scientist or engineer would be able to read . . . Any spies capable of picking up this information," Dr. Urey added, 'will get information more rapidly by staying at home and working in their own laboratories.'*"

Responsible periodicals and science editors commented as follows on Greenglass' testimony:

TIME MAGAZINE: "Some of his testimony made little scientific sense."

LIFE MAGAZINE'S Science Editor: "Greenglass' implosion bomb appears illogical, if not downright unworkable."

SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN: "History's most elaborately guarded secret—how to make an atomic bomb—was casually let out of the bag in a courtroom last month. Or was it?"

POLITICS INSTEAD OF EVIDENCE

The prosecutor set out to show that the defendants were Communists and that Communists are spies. This had nothing to do with either the indictment or proof that the Rosenbergs had conspired to commit espionage. The prosecutor said that the Rosenbergs had allegedly committed this crime because their loyalty was to "communism in this country and communism throughout the world." But he did not establish that the Rosenbergs were Communists. Instead, he showed:

- 1) the Rosenbergs had a Spanish Refugee appeal can in their home;
- 2) Ethel Rosenberg was one of 50,000 New York citizens who had signed a nominating petition in 1941 for Peter V. Cacchione, successful Communist Party candidate for New York City Councilman;
- 3) the Rosenbergs carried sick and death benefit insurance with the International Workers Order, a multi-national, inter-racial fraternal insurance society with 160,000 members in 18 states;
- 4) the Rosenbergs were both active members of their trade unions; Ethel in Local 65 of the Wholesale, Retail and Warehouse Workers Union; Julius in the Federation of Architects, Engineers and Technicians;
- 5) the Rosenbergs occasionally read the Daily Worker;
- 6) the Rosenbergs believed that the Soviet Union had borne the brunt of the war against Nazi Germany, and that it had done its share in wiping out the murderers of 6 million Jews;
- 7) the Rosenbergs had been pleased and lauded the United States and Great Britain for opening up a second front;
- 8) Julius Rosenberg had once been accused of being a Communist, for which he had been fired from the Signal Corps, although he had sworn that he was not a Communist.

AN ARGUMENT FOR FOREIGN POLICY INSTEAD OF EVIDENCE

The prosecutor argued that the atom bomb was "the one weapon that might well hold the key to the survival of this nation." He argued that the United States had made every effort to keep the principles of the atom bomb a secret, and insinuated that since the Soviet Union was by then known to have the bomb, the Rosenbergs must be guilty of having conspired to transmit its secret to that country.

Leaving aside the absurdity of this kind of "proof" against the Rosenbergs, all recognized authorities deny the possibility of atom-bomb monopoly and atom-bomb "secrets." This is what these authorities say:

ATOMICS, a monthly scientific magazine, September 1949: "Since the discovery of uranium fission in 1938 there has been no basic secret regarding an atomic bomb."

SMYTH REPORT, official report of the U. S. government on atomic energy development, published in 1945: ". . . the principles that have been used were well known to the international scientific world in 1940."

INTERNATIONAL NEWS SERVICE, December, 1950, in a story datelined Washington, D. C.: "The Atomic Energy Commission Friday bared secret documentary proof that Russia has known the scientific secrets of atom bomb manufacture since 1940, the year the United States began attempts to develop the missile."

DR. J. ROBERT OPPENHEIMER, in a speech in January, 1951, said, according to the N. Y. Times: ". . . that there were no 'unpublished' secrets concerning atomic weapons, and no 'secret laws of nature' available only to a few."

NEW YORK TIMES, Feb. 24, 1952: "The British development of an atom bomb confirmed what had been apparent when the Russians exploded their bomb in 1949—that the secret of the atom bomb was not a secret, that any nation with the resources could construct one, but only big and wealthy nations could afford this kind of armament."

THE DEATH SENTENCE

In imposing the death sentence against Ethel and Julius Rosenberg, Judge Irving Kaufman said that they had "altered the course of history to the disadvantage of our country . . . we have evidence of your treachery around us every day . . . I believe your conduct has already caused, in my opinion, the Communist aggression in Korea, with resultant casualties exceeding 50,000 and who knows but that millions more of innocent people may pay the price of your treason."

From the Judge's comments, it appears that he sentenced the Rosenbergs to death for crimes with which they were not at all charged. They were neither accused of treason nor was any evidence brought in linking them in any way to the instigation of any wars, past, present, or future. But the Judge's comments and the death sentence, like the jury's verdict, is in line with the

prosecution's inability to bring in convincing proof that the Rosenbergs conspired to commit espionage, substituting, instead, inflammatory and reckless charges that had nothing to do with the case.

It is unthinkable that the same verdict and the same sentence would have been given had these wild accusations formed the basis of a "case" during the war years (when the USSR was our ally), when the alleged conspiracy was supposed to have taken place, or even in the first years following the end of the war.

Further, we can compare the sentences given to confessed or convicted traitors and saboteurs such as Axis Sally and Tokyo Rose, who got ten years each, and the famous Molzahn case in which four men who gave vital secrets to Germany in the Fall of 1941 were let off with 5 to 15 year sentences.

Finally, this is the first time in the history of our country that a civil court has imposed the death sentence for a charge of espionage. No person committing treason, the gravest of all crimes, has ever been executed.

THE TAINT OF ANTI-SEMITISM

Shortly after the trial was over the prosecutor, although Jewish, was severely reprimanded by a United States Court of Appeals for practicing anti-Semitism in another case. This grave charge is bolstered by the fact that the Rosenberg trial, in a city whose population is one-third Jewish, proceeded without a single Jewish juror due to challenges by the prosecution.

Here are comments from the Jewish press:

THE DAY: "The death sentence imposed by Judge Kaufman left the feeling that precisely because he is a Jew did he go to an extreme and deal judgment with a heavy hand . . . that Judge Kaufman is a Jew has perhaps unconsciously motivated him to issue a sentence which, in the opinion of many, is considered to be unjust and brutal."

DAILY FORWARD: "Too horrible . . . every Jew feels the same way."

CHICAGO SENTINEL, an Anglo-Jewish paper, in a column on Feb. 7, 1952 by Rabbi G. George Fox, one of the most widely known Rabbis in the mid-west, an eminent scholar and author: "I am certain that Judge Kaufman's decision will be found unjust, if not illegal."

CONCLUSIONS

- 1) The Rosenbergs were convicted on unsubstantial and incredible evidence.
- 2) The prosecution prejudiced and inflamed the jury by bringing in extraneous issues in every phase of the trial.
- 3) The suspicion of anti-Semitism taints the entire trial.

When it is borne in mind that Ethel and Julius Rosenberg were ordinary folk like the vast majority of us, that they were not leaders of any political or social or economic movements, it becomes clear that a new danger faces this vast majority, the danger that past or present or future views on social issues may become the basis for wild accusations, imprisonment, and even death. That is why it is in the interest of all Americans, regardless of their beliefs and creeds, to make certain that justice is done in the Rosenberg Case.

FOR JUSTICE

WRITE to President Truman and Attorney General J. Howard McGrath. Tell them what you think. Ask that the government consent to a reversal of the Rosenberg conviction, thus permitting a new trial or discontinuance of their prosecution.

URGE your Senators and Congressmen to make the foregoing request to the White House and the Department of Justice.

WRITE the National Committee to Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case for more information. We will send you our new 32-page pamphlet "TO SECURE JUSTICE IN THE ROSENBERG CASE," by William A. Reuben, which tells the whole story. Ask for as many as you can possibly circulate. *Send us a financial contribution—big or little. We need help. Use the form below.*

SPONSORS (Partial List)

Nelson Algren
Emily Alman
Dr. Herbert Aptheker
Ivan Von Auw
Dr. Edward K. Barsky
Prof. E. Berry Burgum
Alice Hill Byrne
John F. Clewe
Rev. I. C. Collins
Rabbi Abraham Cronbach
Prof. Ephraim Cross
Marjorie DiSilva
Dr. Katherine Dodd
Dr. W. E. B. DuBois

Gertrude Evans
Waldo Frank
Joseph Friedman
B. Z. Goldberg
Shirley Graham
Nahum Greenberg
Rabbi Louis D. Gross
Louise Harding Horr
James Imbrie
Rev. Spencer Kennard
Hon. Robert Morss Lovett
Dr. Bernard Lubka

Dr. John Marsalka
John T. McManus
Mrs. Bessie Mitchell
Capt. Hugh N. Mulzac
William A. Reuben
Dr. John L. Simon
Leon Straus
Lois Timmins
Elizabeth Todd
Dr. Leonard Tushnet
Dr. Gene Weltfish

Joseph Brainin, Prov. Chairman
David Alman, Exec. Sec'y.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO SECURE JUSTICE IN THE ROSENBERG CASE
1050 Sixth Avenue, New York 18, N. Y. BRyant 9-9694

I want to receive your material. I enclose \$ _____ to help. Please send me _____ copies of the pamphlet on the Rosenberg case, and _____ copies of the fact sheet.

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____ ZONE _____ STATE _____

Pamphlets 5¢ single copies, \$4.00 per 100, \$15 per 500
Fact Sheet..... 3¢ single copies, \$2.50 per 100, \$8 per 500

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the source of those documents? Where did you get them?

(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. NORTON. I do not recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you present at the home of Mrs. Sylvia Freedland in the fall of 1952 when a meeting was held, attended by Mr. Irving Riskin, Mr. Herman E. Thomas, and others, relating to the Rosenberg matter?

(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. NORTON. Again, sir, I invoke my right under the Constitution not to be compelled to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party in the fall of 1952?

(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. NORTON. I invoke my right not to be compelled to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. To your knowledge was the matter of dissemination of propaganda relating to the Rosenberg case discussed in your presence at any meeting of the Communist Party or in any Communist Party group?

(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. NORTON. Again, sir, I invoke the right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know the name of the president of the National Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case?

Mr. NORTON. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know the name of the chairman?

Mr. NORTON. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know the name of the executive secretary?

Mr. NORTON. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you met on any occasion with any of the officers of that national organization?

(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. NORTON. So far as I know, no.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you on any occasion engaged in teaching?

Mr. NORTON. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you on the teaching staff of the Workers' School?

Mr. NORTON. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have before me a circular for the spring term announcing the courses at the Workers' School, located on 431 South Dearborn Street, Chicago. Your name appears, the name of Theodore Norton appears as an instructor in certain courses there. Does that refresh your recollection?

Mr. RAHILL. Mr. Chairman, may we examine the document?

Chairman WALTER. Surely.

(The witness and counsel examine the document referred to.)

Mr. NORTON. I have never seen this leaflet before. I see that a Theodore Norton is listed there as giving a course. It was not I. I have never heard of the school. I have never been in Chicago except to change trains.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you in 1940 working as librarian at Lafayette College?

Mr. NORTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Therefore, could that course conducted in the spring of 1940 been by you?

Mr. NORTON. Could not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Mr. Herman E. Thomas?
(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. NORTON. I invoke my right under the Constitution of the United States not to be compelled to be a witness again myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Sylvia Freedland?
(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. NORTON. The same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with the person by the name of Ernest Moyer?

(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. NORTON. I give the same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Irving Riskin?
(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. NORTON. The same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Adelaide Riskin?
(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. NORTON. I invoke my right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Billie Jane Lipsett of Easton?

Mr. NORTON. I invoke the right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether Billie Jane Lipsett was a member of the professional cell of the Communist Party in Easton?
(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. NORTON. I invoke my right.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you mean by that you are declining to answer, claiming your privilege under the fifth amendment?

(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. NORTON. Perhaps I should make the whole statement each time. I invoke my right under the Constitution of the United States not to be compelled to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with a person by the name of William Powers, sometimes referred to as Jack?

(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. NORTON. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Mother Ella Reeve Bloor?

(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. NORTON. I invoke my right under the Constitution of the United States not to be compelled to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with William Hood?
(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. NORTON. I invoke my right under the Constitution of the United States not to be compelled to be a witness against myself.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman, do you think it would be a good idea for counsel, when he refers to the names, to state who the person is and what the reference to that person may mean?

Chairman WALTER. This morning a witness named these people.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?
(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. NORTON. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party in 1933?

Mr. NORTON. I invoke my right under the Constitution of the United States not to be compelled to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party in 1954?

Mr. NORTON. I invoke my right not to be compelled to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you affiliated or connected in any way with the work being done in disseminating propaganda relating to the Sobell case?

(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. NORTON. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been a member of the Community Party at any time during the year 1955?

Mr. NORTON. I invoke my right under the Constitution of the United States not to be compelled to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party yesterday?

(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. NORTON. I invoke my right under the Constitution of the United States not to be compelled to be a witness against myself.

Chairman WALTER. Will you join again tomorrow?

(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. NORTON. I invoke my right under the Constitution of the United States not to be compelled to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Isn't it the situation, then, that you are not a member of the Communist Party only while you are on the witness stand?

(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. NORTON. Will you repeat that, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. Isn't the situation, then, substantially this: that for your own purposes you are not a member of the Communist Party while you are on the witness stand?

(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. NORTON. The answer to that is "no," that is not the situation.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then what is it?

(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. NORTON. I have told the committee that I am not a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. You will not tell the committee just why it is you are not a member today, but you will not testify as to what you were yesterday or what you will be tomorrow?

Mr. NORTON. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Chairman WALTER. Mr. Moulder?

Mr. MOULDER. No questions.

Mr. RAHILL. May we request a photostatic copy of this document regarding the Workers' School in Chicago from the committee, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. The document was not put into evidence for the reason it was testified that it is another individual.

Mr. RAHILL. We would appreciate a copy of it since it was dealt with.

Chairman WALTER. In view of the fact that it is not an exhibit, we won't go to that expense. It seems to me that we ought to check further on that.

Mr. RAHILL. We will be very glad to have it done at our expense, Mr. Chairman. It is within your custody; therefore we can't make a copy unless we do it at our expense.

Chairman WALTER. In view of the fact it is not a part of the record now, we will not comply with your request, but I do think you ought to investigate the testimony with respect to it in view of the fact you have shown such an interest in it.

Mr. RAHILL. I will renew my request for a copy at the convenience of the committee.

Chairman WALTER. All right.

Mr. RAHILL. Do we understand that we are discharged from the subpoena?

Chairman WALTER. Yes.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. John B. Stone, will you come forward, please?

Chairman WALTER. Mr. Stone, do you swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. STONE. I do.

TESTIMONY OF JOHN B. STONE, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, JOSEPH FORER

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name?

Mr. STONE. John B. Stone.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted that you are accompanied by counsel. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. FORER. Joseph Forer, 711 14th Street NW., Washington.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where and when were you born?

Mr. STONE. Missoula, Mont., September 19, 1898.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. STONE. 2901 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what profession or occupation are you engaged?

Mr. STONE. I am a newspaperman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been?

Mr. STONE. I was educated in the grammar schools and high school of Missoula, Mont., and the University of Montana. I graduated in 1923 with an A. B. degree in journalism.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been engaged in newspaper work in the city of Washington?

Mr. STONE. Since about 1943. I am not precisely sure of the dates.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to that time what was your occupation or employment?

Mr. STONE. It is a long story. Do you want all of the jobs I worked on?

Mr. TAVENNER. No; immediately prior to 1943.

Mr. STONE. I came to Washington in 1940 to work for the Treasury Department in promoting the sale of defense bonds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that your employment after coming to Washington?

Mr. STONE. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your employment before coming to Washington?

Mr. STONE. Immediately before that I was account-executive of the Illinois Central account of the Caples Co. That was a public relations job for promoting passenger traffic on the Illinois Central.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where was your post of duty?

Mr. STONE. The main office was in Chicago.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you employed in Chicago in that capacity?

Mr. STONE. About a year.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been engaged in newspaper work in Washington continuously since 1943?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What type of employment? By whom are you employed?

Mr. STONE. I am self-employed at this time.

Mr. TAVENNER. How were you employed in 1943?

Mr. STONE. Part of that time, as to the dates I am not specific to be sure, the dates going back to that time, I worked for the Office of War Information. I believe a short time in 1943, and then later in 1943 and for about 4 years following that I was a correspondent on the staff of Newsweek magazine. I worked for the Office of Price Administration possibly in part of 1943, and all of 1942 and possibly part of 1941.

I moved from the Treasury to the Procurement Division of the Treasury where I was a short time a liaison officer with the procurement agents to keep them informed of all of the economic orders on what they should and should not buy.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you employed by the United States Government?

Mr. STONE. From about May 1940 to sometime in 1943. I am not sure of the time.

Mr. TAVENNER. As I understand it, the last newspaper employment you have told us about was your employment by Newsweek?

Mr. STONE. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your next employment?

Mr. STONE. There were several periods in which I did some public relations work. I am not quite sure about the sequence. I was public relations chief for the World Congress of Statisticians which met here at the Shoreham and the Wardman-Park. The Bureau of the Budget commended me highly for that.

Then sometime in the following periods I was a correspondent for the Bridgeport Herald, Washington correspondent for the Bridgeport Herald and for the National Guardian for a short time.

Mr. TAVENNER. During what period were you a correspondent for the National Guardian?

Mr. STONE. That must have been around 1948, a short period around that time. I can't recall exactly.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then what was your next employment?

Mr. STONE. The Federated Press.

Mr. TAVENNER. When were you first employed by the Federated Press?

Mr. STONE. I believe in 1948.

Mr. TAVENNER. That continued for how long a period?

Mr. STONE. The first week in February, this year.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you familiar, Mr. Stone, with the testimony of Mrs. Mary Stalcup Markward before this committee on June 11, 1951, relating to you?

Mr. STONE. I have not seen that testimony and I wasn't here.

Mr. TAVENNER. The testimony is as follows: Question by Mr. Owens:

Next we come to the Rob Hall Club—
meaning club of the Communist Party—
also known as the Newspaper Club.

Mrs. Markward, we have been led to believe that this club changed its name many, many times. Do you have any knowledge regarding this?

Mrs. MARKWARD. Yes, I have. There were various names by which it was known, Lincoln Steffens and John Reed were the most characteristic of the other names by which it was known during that period.

Mr. OWENS. Has the membership of this club been fairly consistent, however?

Mrs. MARKWARD. Yes, at one time when we were tightening up the security it more or less separated into two groups. In other clubs they operated under one leadership, but in this club they divided into two, one Robert Hall, and the other Lincoln Steffens. That was a club separation.

The city organization never recognized that separation, as such.

Mr. OWENS. Can you identify for the committee the individuals whom you knew to be members of the Communist Party of the District of Columbia assigned to this club?

I should state here that Mary Stalcup Markward was requested to become a member of the Communist Party by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and that she worked within the Communist Party in the District of Columbia for approximately 7 years and became treasurer of the Communist Party in the District of Columbia.

Mrs. Markward's answer to the question as to who were the members assigned to this club:

Robert Hall was a member. He is Washington editor of the Daily Worker.

Mr. OWENS. Was he chairman of this club?

Mrs. MARKWARD. I don't believe he held the title. He was their representative to the city organization, however.

Mr. OWENS. Will you continue with the members as you understood it, of this Newspaper Club?

Mrs. MARKWARD. Travis Hedrick was a member of this club until he obtained some employment where he could not continue his activity.

Alden Todd was a member. I believe he worked for the Federated Press.

Millie White Hedrick, the wife of Travis Hedrick, was a member. I believe she worked at the UE office.

Andrew Older, now deceased, and Isabel Older his wife.

John B. Stone.

Then she continued to mention others.

Mr. OWENS. You have mentioned John B. Stone as being a member of the Newspaper Club. Do you have any knowledge of his activity with the National Committee To Defeat the Mundt bill?

Mrs. MARKWARD. No, I know Robert Hall suggested him for membership due to his activity with the Progressive Party.

Mr. Stone, were you a member of the Newspaper Club of the Communist Party in the city of Washington at any time after 1943?

Mr. STONE. I refuse to answer that question based on my privilege under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have been active, have you not, Mr. Stone, in a number of organizations sponsored by the Communist Party, one of which I will mention, which is the World Peace Appeal; is that true?

Mr. STONE. I decline to answer that question under my rights under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee obtained an undated list of the signers of the Stockholm World Peace Appeal on October 23, 1950. Your name appears on that list as Federated Press correspondent. Did you sign the Stockholm World Peace Appeal?

(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. STONE. I decline to answer that for the same reason I gave before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have a working arrangement with the Daily People's World for the printing of articles written by you?

(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. STONE. No, I wrote a lot of things for the Federated Press. I am not sure where they were all printed. I wouldn't be able to tell you.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have before me a number of issues carrying articles by John B. Stone, Federated Press. Does that indicate that there were articles merely carried by the Communist Party papers rather than being contributions directly by you to the Communist Party?

Mr. STONE. That indicates that I wrote that article for the Federated Press just as a United Press correspondent writes an article for the United Press. It might be printed in any paper that subscribes to the Federated Press or the United Press.

Mr. TAVENNER. At a later date there was another organization with which you were purportedly connected, as to which I desire to ask you some questions.

I have before me a photostatic copy of a letter on the stationery or the letterhead of the Washington Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case over the name of John B. Stone. Will you examine it, please, and state whether or not the signature at the bottom of the letter is your signature?

(The witness examines the letter.)

Mr. STONE. I refuse to answer that question for the same reason I gave before, based on my privilege under the fifth amendment, not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the document in evidence and ask that it be marked "Stone Exhibit No. 1." for identification only and made a part of the committee files.

Chairman WALTER. Let it be so marked.

Mr. TAVENNER. The letter in question is addressed "Dear Reverend." Did you disseminate copies of that letter or similar letters to the local clergy in the city of Washington?

Mr. STONE. I refuse to answer that question for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you in 1953 chairman of the Washington Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case?

Mr. STONE. I decline to answer that question for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Below the name John B. Stone there is certain information typed on the exhibit which I just introduced. Will you read it, please, into the record?

Mr. STONE. The document says:

Chairman, Washington Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case.

Chairman WALTER. Is that your signature, Mr. Stone?

Mr. STONE. I decline to answer that for the same reason I have given, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were the officers of the Washington Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case?

Mr. STONE. I refuse to answer that question for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the executive secretary?

Mr. STONE. I refuse to answer that question for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you participate in the raising of funds for use by the Washington Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case?

Mr. STONE. I decline to answer that question for the reason I have stated before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you chairman or did you conduct a meeting sponsored by that Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case on May 4, 1952, at the Odd Fellows Hall, 9th and T NW., Washington, D. C.?

Mr. STONE. I refuse to answer that question for the reason I have given before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you an official of any successor committee to the Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case, such as a committee to secure justice or clemency in the Sobell case?

Mr. STONE. I decline to answer that for the same reason I have cited before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who are the officers of the present organization?

Mr. STONE. I refuse to answer that question for the reason I have given before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is there any statement in the testimony of Mrs. Markward which I read to you untrue, in so far as it related to you?

Mr. STONE. I decline to answer for the same reason I have cited.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. STONE. I refuse to answer under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the period that you were a representative of the Federated Press, were you aware that the Federated Press had been cited as a front organization by this committee as early as 1944?

Mr. STONE. I have seen such a report, sir, and I place no more credence in it than I do the reports of the committee now.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you place any credence in the committee's report as to the Communist Party being a subversive organization?

Mr. STONE. I have never seen that report.

Chairman WALTER. I think we can arrange for you to get a copy.

Mr. STONE. Very good, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. What is your opinion of the Communist Party? Do you believe that it is a subversive organization?

(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. STONE. I would have to have the term "subversive" defined before I could answer such a question as that. That is a very "if" question.

If subversive means to be in favor of equal rights for citizens of all races and creeds and colors——

Chairman WALTER. Never mind that. You do not mean it and you know you do not mean it. That is just as bad as the attempts that have been made to inject something else into this hearing.

Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. STONE. I have never made any attempt to interject anything.

Chairman WALTER. Never mind.

Mr. STONE. I was asked a simple question ; I gave a simple answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no more questions, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WALTER. Did you work for the Federated Press?

Mr. STONE. Yes, I have answered that ; I did work for them.

Chairman WALTER. Did you know when you worked for it that it had been cited as a subversive organization?

Mr. STONE. By the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I had seen such a report ; yes, sir.

(At this point Mr. Willis entered the committee room.)

Chairman WALTER. The witness is excused.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Ethel Weichbrod, will you come forward, please?

Chairman WALTER. Will you raise your right hand, please?

Do you swear that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. WEICHBROD. I do.

TESTIMONY OF MRS. ETHEL WEICHBROD, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, JOSEPH FORER

Chairman WALTER. I notice a number of witnesses with the Wexley book. I would like to recommend to them the book written by Dr. Fineberg on the Rosenberg case.

Mrs. WEICHBROD. Are you recommending that to me, sir?

Chairman WALTER. Yes.

Mr. FORER. How about trading?

Mrs. WEICHBROD. That might be a good idea.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

Mrs. WEICHBROD. Ethel Weichbrod.

Mr. TAVENNER. Miss or Mrs.?

Mrs. WEICHBROD. Mrs., mother of 4 children, left home for 2 days.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted that you are accompanied by the same counsel who appeared for the previous witness.

Where do you reside, Mrs. Weichbrod?

Mrs. WEICHBROD. 8321 Tahona Drive, Silver Spring, Md.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in the area of Washington?

Mrs. WEICHBROD. Since April 1942.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to that time where did you live?

Mrs. WEICHBROD. In Brooklyn, N. Y.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you born in Brooklyn?

Mrs. WEICHBROD. Yes, I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. What profession or occupation have you followed since being in Washington, besides being a housewife?

Mrs. WEICHBROD. I have always been an office worker and secretary.

Mr. TAVENNER. What type of office work and employed by whom?

Mrs. WEICHBROD. Since I am in Washington?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mrs. WEICHBROD. In the middle of April 1942, I worked for the Soviet Purchasing Commission until, I believe, April of 1945; the Commission that was buying material for the war and for the Government that was our great ally during that war.

Mr. MOULDER. How did you happen to come in contact with this Soviet Purchasing Commission?

Mrs. WEICHBROD. When I came back to Washington, sir—by the way, I don't know whom I am addressing.

Mr. MOULDER. My name is Moulder.

Mrs. WEICHBROD. Thank you. Mr. Moulder, when I came down to Washington in April 1942, I spent several days relaxing and setting up my apartment and went out job hunting. It was simply one of the few places I happened to look for a job. They were in so desperate need of help at that time that they hired me almost immediately. I believe I started working the day after I was interviewed.

Mr. MOULDER. Did you move here to Washington for the purpose of working here?

Mrs. WEICHBROD. No, I moved here because my husband's employment had been moved to Washington.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that known as Amtorg?

Mrs. WEICHBROD. I believe the Soviet Purchasing Commission was an outgrowth of the Amtorg Commission.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you employed by that organization from 1942 to 1945?

Mrs. WEICHBROD. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your next employment?

Mrs. WEICHBROD. My next employment was as mother. My first born was born on June 1, 1945.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been employed outside of your home since that time?

Mrs. WEICHBROD. No, I haven't.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to your coming to the city of Washington, what was your employment in Brooklyn?

Mrs. WEICHBROD. I believe my first job started in 1936. It was in a lace house in New York City. That continued until 1940. That particular establishment moved to New Jersey. It was one of the so-called runaway shops, running away from trade union organization. I then got a job in a garment shop in early 1941, I believe it was, and then worked there until I moved to Washington.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, briefly, what your formal educational training has been?

Mrs. WEICHBROD. I went to elementary school and high school in Brooklyn, N. Y. I attended 2 years in Brooklyn College, evening session.

Mr. MOULDER. What was your maiden name?

Mrs. WEICHBROD. My full maiden name was Ethel Medoi.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Weichbrod, were you a member of the Communist Party in 1952?

Mrs. WEICHBROD. I am afraid I will have to refuse to answer that question on the basis of—

Mr. WILLIS. Do not be afraid of anything you say.

Mrs. WEICHBROD. I beg your pardon.

Chairman WALTER. You said "I am afraid I will have to decline to answer."

Mrs. WEICHBROD. I will be glad to explain why I am afraid.

Chairman WALTER. Answer the question.

Mrs. WEICHBROD. I refuse to answer the question, Mr. Chairman, on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment, not to be a witness against myself. If you care, I will elaborate on my opening statement.

Chairman WALTER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to an investigation that the committee has made, it appears that there was a meeting held on May 4, 1952, in the first floor auditorium of the Odd Fellows Hall, Ninth and T Streets NW., and at that meeting Mr. John B. Stone addressed the group and introduced as local chairman Ethel Weichbrod of Silver Spring, Md.

Were you local chairman of the Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case in Washington?

Mrs. WEICHBROD. I refuse to answer that question, sir, on the basis of my right under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you at one time become the secretary of that organization?

Mrs. WEICHBROD. I will have to refuse to answer that question on the same basis.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether at this meeting on May 4, to which I have referred, that you made a talk during the course of which you read from a handbill that you had taken from the bulletin board at the Jewish center and that the poster warned against giving the Rosenberg committee support and asked that the center be contacted for information it had on this group before any commitments of support were made? Do you recall having read such a bulletin?

Mrs. WEICHBROD. I don't quite understand your question, Mr. Tavenner. Do I recall the bulletin that you are speaking of?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mrs. WEICHBROD. If you had the bulletin, I might be able to answer your question intelligently. On this basis I am afraid I can't.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you at the meeting I referred to read a bulletin you had procured, which advised that before any commitments were made to the Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case, the Jewish center should be contacted for information that it had regarding that organization?

(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mrs. WEICHBROD. I refuse to answer that question on the same basis.

Chairman WALTER. I think at this point, Mr. Tavenner, I would like to read what the National Community Relations Advisory Council prepared for all of the Jewish community relation agencies to issue:

Any group of American citizens has a right to express his views as to the severity of the sentence in any criminal case. Attempts are being made, how-

ever, by a Communist-inspired group called the National Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case, to inject false issue of antisemitism in the Rosenberg case. We condemn these efforts to mislead the people of this country by unsupported charges that the religious ancestry of the defendants was a factor in the case. We denounce this fraudulent effort to confuse and manipulate public opinion for ulterior political purposes.

Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you participate in drives for money for the Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case?

Mrs. WEICHBROD. I refuse to answer that question on the same basis, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you at this time a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. WEICHBROD. I refuse to answer, too, on the same basis.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you at this time an officer of any successor organization to the Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case, such as a committee to secure justice or clemency for Morton Sobell?

Mrs. WEICHBROD. I refuse to answer that question on the same basis.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WALTER. Are there any questions?

Mr. WILLIS. No questions.

Mr. MOULDER. No questions.

Chairman WALTER. The witness is excused.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

The committee will stand in recess for 5 minutes.

(A short recess was taken.)

(At the conclusion of the recess Chairman Walter and Mr. Willis were present in the committee room.)

Chairman WALTER. The committee will come to order.

Call your next witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Czarnowski.

Chairman WALTER. Do you swear that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. I do.

TESTIMONY OF ANZELM A. CZARNOWSKI

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your full name?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. Anzelm A. Czarnowski.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Czarnowski, I interrupted your testimony in executive session this afternoon to ask you about an entirely different matter than that about which you have been testifying today. For purpose of the record I want to ask a few questions about your background.

When and where were you born?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. I was born in Poland, August 12, 1896.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you come to this country?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. In 1913.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a naturalized American citizen?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you naturalized?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. I was naturalized by act of Congress while I was in the Army, in Waco, Tex.

Mr. WILLIS. What Army?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. In the the United States Army.

Mr. WILLIS. When?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. In 1917.

Mr. WILLIS. The First World War?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. The First World War, yes. I served 2 years in the United States Army.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Czarnowski, where do you now reside?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. I reside at 7513 West 63d Street, Argo, Ill.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that a suburb of Chicago?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in the vicinity of Chicago?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. About 30 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. During that period of time did you have occasion to become a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. Yes, sir; during the war——

Mr. TAVENNER. Which war?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. The Second World War; I had a boy in the service. The same business that I was in the First World War, and I got a job in a defense plant in La Grange, Ill., at the Electric Motors Corp. I was employed at the Electric Motors plant.

I had reported some Nazi activities or anti-American activities such as preventing of purchase of bonds and other Nazi activities for the FBI. They asked me whether I wanted to help them in combating communism and I agreed to that, provided I see my priest. So when that was done I joined to help them out.

Mr. TAVENNER. You wanted an explanation made to your priest as to the reason why you were entering the Communist Party?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. Yes, sir. You see, my church, if I would be a member of the Communist Party, I would be subject to excommunication.

Mr. WILLIS. What church?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. The Roman Catholic Church.

Mr. TAVENNER. After conference with your priest, you agreed to help the United States Government by working for the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. I didn't have a conference with the priest. I asked them to do it.

Mr. WILLIS. When was that?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. That was about October 1943.

Mr. TAVENNER. For how long a period of time did you work for the United States Government in that capacity?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. Up to January 20, 1955, when I became a star witness in the Lightfoot case.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were a witness for the Government in the Smith Act case against Lightfoot?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of course, that exposed your identity.

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understand you are giving the committee in executive testimony the benefit of your knowledge and experience during that period of time from 1943 until 1955.

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILLIS. What was that question again?

Mr. TAVENNER. I say I understand that he is now giving to the committee in executive session the benefit of his experience and knowledge within the Communist Party from 1943 until 1955. I do not want to duplicate effort by going into the general experience in the Communist Party and general knowledge at this time. What I do want to ask you is this. What position did you attain in the Communist Party, between 1952 and 1955?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. I was a literature director for the Argo Branch and for the Electromotive Branch. They used to call that the Auto No. 1 Branch.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of the Communist Party?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. Yes, that is an industrial branch.

Chairman WALTER. What union was that?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. That was United Automobile Workers of America, CIO.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did your work in the Communist Party bring you in touch with the Communist Party section organization?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. Yes, sir, I attended some of the section conventions and several section meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. We are inquiring here at this open hearing about Communist Party activities in the propaganda work relating to the Rosenberg case. I want to confine my questions to that subject. While you were working as literature director, did the Communist Party take any action or engage in any activity in connection with the Rosenberg case?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. There was some literature that was promoted by the section to be distributed to the cells, and they in turn distributed it to the public.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you required to participate in any way in that matter?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. Yes, sir. The way we worked it is some of the literature, I am thinking of general literature, how they work it, which were 5 or 3 cents apiece, it is up to me to buy several of them and if I can collect my 3 or 5 cents, it is O. K., but if not, it is more important to have the person I contact read than to collect the 3 cents, even though it is out of my pocket. But the main thing was to distribute the literature. In our club each member had to take at least 5, some of them took 10, 25, 50.

Mr. TAVENNER. What particular literature are you talking about?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. I am talking about all kinds of Communist literature. For instance, about the A-bomb, the Rosenberg case, the propaganda that is going on now to free Sobell, and many other such things. The Five-Power Conference, Peace Conference in Stockholm, and other such literature.

One interesting one was William Patterson's booklet, We Charge Genocide.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you obtain these documents?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. I always got them from the Modern Bookstore, which is a Communist-controlled bookstore.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the city of Chicago?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. Yes, 64 West Randolph Street in Chicago.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee just how you managed to get the material, what was the plan for getting the material from that bookshop?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. Well, it all depends on the section or the branch. Now, in the section that I belonged to, I always had a certain amount of PA's which is Political Affairs. Then some Masses and Masses and Main Stream, and the Bucharest Peace is a paper from Bucharest, and then when I got to the bookstore and they had something real important they told me, "Now, here is a leaflet that should be used at the educational and for distribution." Some of that was one of the—if I see it—Rosenberg booklet, with the pictures of the Rosenbergs in it. It was gotten from the bookstore, distributed to branches, and the branches distributed it to the public.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have examined a number of pieces of Rosenberg literature presented to you by the staff and identified them as documents which you obtained from this Communist Party bookstore, have you not?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. Yes, sir. I want to mention, too, that since a lot of people—you know, the American people despise the Communist, there is no question about it, but to have them read it, they go in a place and lose a leaflet, you know what I mean. I want to have it distributed here among people, I just drop one here and let it go. Then somebody else picks it up and reads it. Some people will get interested and read it. That is one way of distribution.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you identified certain of those articles of literature which you obtained?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Those particular ones which you identified were published by the National Committee To Secure Justice for the Rosenbergs?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was material also published by the Communist Party?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. There was some literature it published.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were you told to do with this material which you got from the Communist Party bookstore dealing with the Rosenberg matter?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. We were supposed to distribute that to the public. Each member of the Communist Party was responsible to purchase many copies and then distribute them to the public.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that done in Chicago?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you advised in any Communist Party meeting whether or not there was an organization that had been set up outside of the Communist Party to do the same thing?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You yourself don't know of any separate organization doing that same thing with regard to the Rosenberg documents in Chicago?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are just telling us what was done by the Communist Party in regard to it?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. Yes, sir, because I purchased some of this literature, whether I needed it or not.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was that Communist Party literature paid for, or was it paid for? I am speaking now of the Rosenberg material.

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. By the individual members of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have to pay the bookstore for it, or did the bookstore make some arrangements about payment for it?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. Well, I was told that I should lay out money for the section and they would pay me back, but they had a credit account, the southwest section of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Had a credit account at the bookstore?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. Yes, at the bookstore, and at times when I didn't have any money, with me, they just put it on the books.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether the bookstore was actually paid or not by the Communist Party at a later date?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. Yes, I know, because at one time they owed around \$8 and they told me to tell the section.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that work going on right up until the time that you stopped your work in the Communist Party to become a witness in the Lightfoot case?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. Yes, sir. I don't know just how close to it.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think that is all I want to ask him.

Chairman WALTER. Any questions?

Mr. WILLIS. Where were you born?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. In Poland.

Mr. WILLIS. When did you enter the country?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. In 1913.

Mr. WILLIS. And you are an American citizen?

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILLIS. We have had a lot of witnesses appear before us, Mr. Czarnowski, and while you were testifying I noticed some snickering going on in the room.

During these hearings there have been present Congressman Doyle from California, the Far West; Mr. Scherer from Ohio, somewhere in the midpart of the United States; Mr. Moulder from Missouri, which would be somewhere in the Midwest; Mr. Walter, our chairman, from the East; I am from the South, from Louisiana.

Now, let me tell you something. This Congress is composed of 435 Representatives of the people on the House side, and 96 on the Senate side. We disagree on many things—South, West, East, North. But there is one thing we don't disagree on, and that is our feeling toward people like you, born abroad, coming over here, dedicated to documents such as the Constitution of the United States, the Sermon on the Mount; you have come here without a lawyer, without a thick book before you to tempt us to question you about the book, opened your soul and told us exactly how you feel about these things.

May I say further: Don't give up. I think we know what we are talking about. I think that the representatives of the people here reflect by and large how the people of America feel about this thing. We wouldn't be here very long unless we reflected that feeling. There may be some defections here and there, and now and then one who might go wrong, but by and large this Congress knows how the people feel.

Now, my dear friend, don't you give up what you are doing. You keep it up, and never mind the snickering from the back row. I compliment you, sir.

Mr. CZARNOWSKI. Thank you Mr. Congressman. I have one thing to say. This snickering is an old thing with me because I was helping the snickering, too, when I was a member of the Communist Party. That is one good way of finding Communists. I sure thank you very much.

Chairman WALTER. I think in that connection you might be interested in knowing that when the appropriation bill for the work of this committee came up in the House of Representatives there wasn't one single vote cast against it. When you consider that there are a great many very liberal Members in the House of Representatives, I think it bears out the truth of Mr. Willis' observation. Thank you very much, Mr. Czarnowski.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

Do you have another witness, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Josephine Granat, will you come forward, please.

Chairman WALTER. Will you stand and raise your right hand. Do you swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. GRANAT. I do.

Chairman WALTER. What was your reply?

Mrs. GRANAT. I said "I do."

TESTIMONY OF MRS. JOSEPHINE GRANAT, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, JOSEPH FORER

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your name, please.

Mrs. GRANAT. Mrs. Josephine Granat. G-r-a-n-a-t.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel please identify himself for the record.

Mr. FORER. Joseph Forer, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Mrs. GRANAT. I would like to say that I also have a statement to make to the committee. I noticed the other witness did.

Chairman WALTER. If you just answer the questions asked by Mr. Tavenner, we will get along nicely.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you reside?

Mrs. GRANAT. 1163 East 54th Street, Chicago, Ill.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in Chicago?

Mrs. GRANAT. Since the early forties.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, where you were born.

Mrs. GRANAT. Griffin, Ga.

Mr. TAVENNER. What has been your formal educational training?

Mrs. GRANAT. I am a graduate of the Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Ill., 1948, department of political science. I studied at Chicago Teachers College, Chicago, Ill., during the summer of 1948, I believe, to get educational courses. Inasmuch as there is a tremendous amount of discrimination in employment, I could not find a job in my profession. I had to enter a business college. I entered a business school in 1949, Cortez-Peters Business College.

Chairman WALTER. Where is this discrimination?

Mrs. GRANAT. Chicago. I couldn't find a job.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession?

Mrs. GRANAT. Teaching.

Mr. TAVENNER. What has been your employment since 1949?

Mrs. GRANAT. Presently I am working for the Christian Advocate.

Mr. TAVENNER. What has been your employment from 1949 on?

Mrs. GRANAT. I will say regarding my employment, in 1949 I worked for the Chicago Tenants and Consumer Council.

Mr. TAVENNER. For how long a period?

Mrs. GRANAT. It was a period of a little more than a year, I don't remember exactly when; some time in 1950, in latter 1950 or 1951, I believe. The organization, after the rent-control act went out, after rent control expired, went out of existence.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that a Federal employment job?

Mrs. GRANAT. No, it was not.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the nature of your position?

Mrs. GRANAT. I was secretary.

Mr. TAVENNER. Secretary of what?

Mrs. GRANAT. Of the Tenants Council.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your next employment?

Mrs. GRANAT. Regarding any other questions along this line, I will tell you now I will refuse to answer on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. WILLIS. In other words, you refuse to answer before you are questioned?

Mrs. GRANAT. He asked me.

Mr. WILLIS. Did he?

Mr. TAVENNER. I asked what her employment was after 1951.

Mr. WILLIS. I am sorry. I didn't realize it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee whether or not Mr. Nelson Algren was at any time chairman of the Chicago Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case?

Mrs. GRANAT. It is a matter of public record, I am pretty certain, who the officers were of any committee that was established in Chicago.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer the question, please?

Mrs. GRANAT. I will refuse to answer for the same reason I have given before.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I ask a direction of the witness to answer.

Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer the question.

Mrs. GRANAT. I will abide by my refusal.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, Nelson Algren, if you recall, was subpoenaed as a witness before the committee, but you postponed his appearance for some special reason that he took up with you.

Chairman WALTER. I believe he was ill.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am not sure that was it, but he was finally reached in Montana and you continued his appearance.

I hand you a photostatic copy of any authorized signature for the Chicago Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case which was procured by subpoena duces tecum by the committee, and I will ask you to examine it, please, and state whether or not the name Jo Granat appears as secretary of the organization in August 1952 (handing document to witness).

Mrs. GRANAT. It says Jo Granat.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you the secretary as indicated on the authorized signature card?

Mrs. GRANAT. I feel very strongly about the Rosenberg case.

Chairman WALTER. Never mind that. We don't care how you feel about the Rosenberg case.

Mrs. GRANAT. I want to answer in my own way, if you don't mind.

Chairman WALTER. You are not going to make a speech. Answer the question.

Mrs. GRANAT. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WALTER. You are not going to make a speech. You understand that?

Mrs. GRANAT. Mr. Chairman, if I am going to answer questions, I will answer it in my own way.

Chairman WALTER. We have our own feeling about the Rosenberg case. What was the question?

Mr. TAVENNER. Whether or not she was executive secretary in August 1952 of the Chicago Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case.

Mrs. GRANAT. Do you want my answer to that question?

Chairman WALTER. That is a simple question.

Mrs. GRANAT. I will answer it in my way. No one will tell me how to answer a question.

Chairman WALTER. Yes or no, or the fifth amendment, but I don't want to hear your views.

Mrs. GRANAT. I don't want you to put words in my mouth.

Chairman WALTER. Answer the question.

Mrs. GRANAT. I will answer it in my way, if this committee wants to hear my answer.

Chairman WALTER. You are not going to make a speech.

Mrs. GRANAT. I have no desire to make a speech, and I will answer the question.

Chairman WALTER. No, you are not going to read whatever this drivel is, this Commie stuff that we have heard so much.

Mrs. GRANAT. Inasmuch as you have made up your own mind about this committee, I don't know why you are wasting the taxpayers' money with these hearings.

Chairman WALTER. Will you answer the question, please.

Mrs. GRANAT. I will answer the question this way.

Chairman WALTER. No, you are not going to read that paper.

Mrs. GRANAT. I will answer the question, I will refuse to answer the question based on my basis of the fifth amendment, which is my privilege not to testify against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Attached to the photostatic copy of the authorized signature card is a certificate of authority for organization which closes with this language:

In witness whereof, I have subscribed my name as executive secretary and have caused the seal of said organization to be hereunto affixed. Jo Granat, Secretary.

Is that your signature (handing document to witness)?

Mrs. GRANAT. I will refuse to answer for the same reason I have given before.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the document in evidence and ask it be marked as "Granat Exhibit No. 1," for identification purposes only and made a part of the committee files.

Chairman WALTER. Mark it and let it be received.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee's investigation, Mrs. Granat, shows or indicates that you were a member of the policy committee of a con-

vention held in the city of Chicago in 1953, and on that committee were Herman Tamsky and Dr. Leonard Tushnet of New Jersey.

Did you serve on such a committee with Dr. Tushnet of New Jersey and Herman Tamsky of Massachusetts?

Mrs. GRANAT. I will refuse to answer for the same reason that I have given before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Dr. Tushnet known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. GRANAT. I will refuse to answer for the same reason I have given before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Herman Tamsky known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. GRANAT. I think you know the purpose; this has nothing to do with what your stated purpose of this investigation was.

Chairman WALTER. We are the best judges of that. Proceed.

Mrs. GRANAT. I resent this line of questioning. I think that it is a real abridgment of the first amendment of our Constitution, which guarantees the right of free speech, the right of freedom of association. For that reason I will refuse to answer and also I will refuse to answer on the same basis that I have stated before.

Mr. WILLIS. Why don't you stand only on the first amendment?

Mrs. GRANAT. You will not tell me how to answer these questions.

Chairman WALTER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Donald Rothenberg from Ohio and Reid Robinson from California serve on an organizational committee at that convention in Chicago in 1953?

Mrs. GRANAT. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee in the course of its investigation has learned that you remitted certain sums collected in the city of Chicago to the national organization of the Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenbergs Case. It was indicated that only half the sum collected was remitted. Will you tell the committee whether or not it was the practice to reserve for local purposes one-half of such funds collected?

Mrs. GRANAT. Your question is a very vague one. I have no idea what you are talking about, and I would refuse to answer it anyway on the basis of the—

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you make remittances to the national organization of funds collected?

Mrs. GRANAT. I will refuse to answer on the same basis I have stated before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you make remittances on the basis of 50 percent of what was collected?

Mrs. GRANAT. I will refuse to answer that on the same basis I have stated before.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee's investigation further discloses that a Civil Rights Congress and Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade rally—that is, a rally sponsored by those organizations—was held on March 4, 1953, in honor of Steve Nelson at the People's Auditorium in Chicago. Did you participate in it?

Mrs. GRANAT. I refuse to answer on the same basis that I have stated before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you shortly after March 4, 1953, resign as executive secretary of the Chicago Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case?

Mrs. GRANAT. That is a loaded question and you know it. I will refuse to answer on the same basis I have stated before.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is not a loaded question. I want to know whether or not you withdrew from that organization in order to select another position. I don't care how the question is put. You can put the question yourself and answer it.

Mrs. GRANAT. I will refuse to answer on the same basis I have stated before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Didn't you a few months after March 4, 1953, become the executive secretary of the Civil Rights Congress?

Mrs. GRANAT. I will refuse to answer that on the same basis.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you secretary of the Lightfoot Defense Committee?

Mrs. GRANAT. I will refuse to answer that question on the same basis. (The witness consulted with her counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you at any time a member of the International Workers Order?

Mrs. GRANAT. I will refuse to answer on the basis that I have stated before.

(The witness consulted with her counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Wasn't your appointment or selection as executive secretary of the Civil Rights Congress announced publicly on May 5, 1954, by John T. Bernard, former member of Congress, acting as chairman of the Civil Rights Congress?

Mrs. GRANAT. Mr. Tavenner, I have never been selected, appointed, or any of these things that you are trying to infer. Whatever I have ever done I have done on the basis of my own, the dictates of my own conscience, whatever I have said I have said, whatever I felt, whatever actions I have taken, nobody tells me what to do, just as you are not going to tell me here today how to answer anything, because nobody does.

Chairman WALTER. Answer the question, please.

Mrs. GRANAT. I will refuse to answer on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. You said you were not elected or appointed. Were you in any manner acting as executive secretary of the Civil Rights Congress?

Mrs. GRANAT. I refuse to answer on the same basis.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. GRANAT. I refuse to answer on the same basis as I have stated before. You know if you were really interested in doing something about the injustices or what you consider un-American activities, it seems to me you ought to participate or join in the request for an investigation of the Rosenberg-Sobell trial. In that way the facts of the case will be revealed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you connected in any way with an organization or committee for justice or for clemency for Morton Sobell?

Mrs. GRANAT. I will refuse to answer that on the same basis.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Chairman WALTER. The witness is excused. Call your next witness, Mr. Tavenner.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Ruth Belmont.

Chairman WALTER. Do you swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Miss BELMONT. I do.

**TESTIMONY OF RUTH BELMONT, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL,
JOSEPH FORER**

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you Ruth Belmont?

Miss BELMONT. That is my name, yes, Ruth Belmont.

Mr. TAVENNER. Miss or Mrs.?

Miss BELMONT. Miss.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted that you are accompanied by the same counsel who accompanied the preceding witness.

Where do you reside?

Miss BELMONT. Chicago, Ill.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in Chicago?

Miss BELMONT. Since 1947.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you live prior to that time?

Miss BELMONT. I lived in Detroit, Mich.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you live in Detroit?

Miss BELMONT. Approximately 5 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. That would be from 1942 approximately to 1947?

Miss BELMONT. 1943, I believe, 4 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to that where did you reside?

Miss BELMONT. I come from Brooklyn, N.Y.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you leave your home in Brooklyn to take up your residence in Detroit?

Miss BELMONT. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. I presume you were born in Brooklyn?

Miss BELMONT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your employment while living in Detroit?

Miss BELMONT. I have held various positions as an office secretary and office worker.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your employment as office worker or secretary in Detroit?

(The witness consulted with her counsel.)

Miss BELMONT. I think I would prefer to invoke the privilege under the fifth amendment and not bear witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you refuse to answer?

Miss BELMONT. I refuse to answer the question, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been employed since 1947 while living in Chicago?

Miss BELMONT. Yes. I have.

Mr. TAVENNER. What has been the nature of your employment?

Miss BELMONT. My most recent employment has been as an office secretary.

Mr. TAVENNER. Employed by whom?

Miss BELMONT. A manufacturing concern.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been.

Miss BELMONT. Yes. I have finished high school, attended a couple of years of college at Brooklyn College, and I have taken courses from

time to time at Columbia, and I have also gone to Northwestern University.

Mr. TAVENNER. Miss Belmont, I hand you an authorized signature card for the Chicago Sobell Committee, attached to which is a certificate of authority for organization of the Chicago Sobell Committee. The certificate of authority closes with this language:

In witness whereof I have subscribed my name as secretary and have caused the seal of said organization to be hereto affixed, this 4th day of February 1955. Will you examine the name appearing as secretary and state what name you see there [handing document to witness].

Miss BELMONT. Yes; it says "Ruth Belmont, secretary," on this document.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is the signature of the name appearing there your signature?

Miss BELMONT. I refuse to answer under the privileges of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you the executive secretary of the Chicago Sobell Committee on February 4, 1955?

(The witness consulted with her counsel.)

Miss BELMONT. I refuse on the same basis.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you secretary of that organization now?

Miss BELMONT. I refuse to answer on the same basis.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the document in evidence and ask it be marked "Belmont Exhibit No. 1" for identification only and made a part of the committee files.

Chairman WALTER. It may be so marked and received.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted from the certificate of authority for organization that the chairman of that organization is Ruth Rothstein. Are you acquainted with her?

Miss BELMONT. I refuse to answer that question on the previous basis I stated before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, Ruth Rothstein was subpoenaed as a witness before the committee at this time, but due to the receipt of a doctor's certificate showing sufficient cause for her not to appear, she was excused.

Miss BELMONT. Mr. Chairman, I would like—I would be very happy to make any kind of statement here in regard to the Rosenberg-Sobell case.

Chairman WALTER. We are not interested in knowing your opinion. This case has been before the higher courts of the land 7 times over a period of 2 years. So we are not concerned with your opinion.

Miss BELMONT. The Supreme Court has never reviewed the Rosenberg-Sobell case.

Chairman WALTER. We are not interested in your views.

Miss BELMONT. This is not views. This is a legal fact, sir.

Chairman WALTER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. While living in Detroit, did you become acquainted with the person named Bereniece Baldwin?

Miss BELMONT. I refuse to answer that question on the same basis.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Bereniece Baldwin became secretary of the Communist Party in the city of Detroit for the United States Government in an undercover capacity under the direction of the Federal Bureau of investigation. She indicated in testimony before this com-

mittee that Ruth Belmont, holder of Communist Party card No. 68709, 1947, transferred from the Johns Club, a professional club, of the Communist Party, to Chicago, Ill., effective July 14, 1947. It is noted that it was in 1947 that you left Detroit and went to Chicago. Were you a member of the Communist Party in Detroit in 1947?

Miss BELMONT. I refuse to answer that question on the same basis.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was your Communist Party membership transferred from Detroit to Chicago as indicated by Mrs. Baldwin?

Miss BELMONT. I refuse to answer the question on the same basis.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you not the holder of a Communist Party card in 1947 as stated by Mrs. Baldwin?

Miss BELMONT. I refuse to answer that question on the same basis. You know, I think that as a Chicagoan I feel very proud of the fact that hundreds of thousands of people have expressed themselves on an injustice that existed in the Rosenberg-Sobell case, and that a tremendous amount of work was done by many, many people to look into the facts of the case, and I think it is outrageous that this committee refuses to read material that would actually give them the information on this case and instead implying through this kind of evidence to besmirch a committee that was doing a job through humanity and that merely appealed for clemency in the lives of two people.

Chairman WALTER. In view of the fact that you seem to have made a very careful study of this thing, I am interested in knowing why it is that after the Rosenbergs were punished, and there is no amount of money that can do anything for them now, that of the money collected since that time less than 2 percent went to the benefit of their children.

Miss BELMONT. I am sorry, sir, I don't know what the disbursements of funds are.

Chairman WALTER. That comes from an account filed by the Rosenberg committee.

Miss BELMONT. According to the material, Mr. Walter, there has been a separate fund established for the children, a trust fund, and I think you can get that information very easily as to what money it provided for the two children.

Mr. TAVENNER. But the Communist Party was using the children as a means of propaganda to raise funds for purposes it was interested in, did it not?

Miss BELMONT. I refuse to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have expressed or indicated considerable knowledge or study of the Rosenberg case. Here is evidence, positive, sworn evidence, by Mrs. Bereniece Baldwin, even to the extent of the number of your Communist Party card. You certainly are in a position to tell this committee what the purpose of the Communist Party was in engaging in propaganda activities relating to the Rosenberg case if you will tell us. Will you tell us?

Miss BELMONT. I refuse to answer that question on the same basis previously stated.

(Witness consulted her counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Miss BELMONT. I refuse to answer that question on the same basis.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Chairman WALTER. Any questions?

Mr. WILLIS. No.

Chairman WALTER. You are excused.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

Mr. TAVENNER. That is all the witnesses I have.

Chairman WALTER. It is interesting to me to note that the witness who complained a while ago about being forced to come here and leave her children alone at home has been here 2 hours and 7 minutes since she registered the complaint.

The committee will stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 4:55 p. m. August 3, 1955, the committee recessed to reconvene at 10 a. m. the following day, August 4, 1955.)

(Testimony of witnesses appearing on August 4-5, 1955, printed in part II of this series.)

×

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05706 3222

u. l. l

322 = NY pgs 5-8

2

3223 = OWO

def

3224 = LA pgs 1-4

g

3225 = SD

h

3226 = Rosenberg pgs 1-2

